DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 348 UD 011 603

AUTHOR	Levine, Daniel U.; And Others
TITLE	The Attitudes of Students at Black High Schools in Five Cities, Spring 1970.
INSTITUTION	Greater Kansas City Mental Health Foundation.; Missouri Univ., Kansas City. Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	103p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Activism, Black Community, Black Power, Data Analysis, High Schools, *Negro Attitudes, Negro Institutions, Negro Leadership, *Negro Organizations, *Negro Youth, *Race Relations, Research Methodology, *Self Concept, Social Change

ABSTRACT

This is the report of a 1970 followup (to a similar one conducted in 1968) study, the purposes of which were to: (1) determine whether or how the attitudes of Kansas City respondents resembled or differed from attitudes of black youth in other parts of the United States, and (2) determine whether or how much change had occurred in the attitudes of Kansas City youth in a two-year period. Despite problems, data was collected in five cities in various parts of the United States. Major generalizations of the study included the following: (1) attitudes of black youth were relatively uniform from city to city; (2) respondents tended to have little contact with whites but tended to reject separatism & violence; (3) youth in larger cities with larger ghettoes tended to be more fatalistic and alienated; and, (4) widespread support exists for the NAACP, the Black Panthers, and active local organizations. (Author/DM)

ED051348

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS AT BLACK HIGH SCHOOLS IN FIVE CITIES, SPRING 1970

Daniel U. Levine
Norman S. Fiddmont
Robert S. Stephenson
Charles B. Wilkinson

Greater Kansas City Mental Health Foundation

Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems
in Education, School of Education, University
of Missouri - Kansas City

April 1971

National Institute of Mental Health Grant 1 RO 3 MH 17107
PHS Appropriation o - 3962026 FY 70

UD011603

INTRODUCTION

Spurred by the 1954 Supreme Court Decision outlawing segregation in public schools, black Americans have been determined to eliminate all obstacles that prevent them from exercising their full constitutional rights. Their determination to overcome racial barriers has tested the nation's commitment to freedom and equality for all its citizens. Using such slogans as "Freedom Now" and, more recently, "Black Power," black leaders have rallied their constituents to participate in gigantic demonstrations in the nation's capital and to risk their personal safety resisting discriminatory customs and practices.

Efforts to eliminate discrimination due to racial or ethnic background have resulted in some positive changes. Civil rights laws have been enacted and many private citizens from all social strata have worked to make personal merit and integrity the basis for acceptance in U. S. society. But even though black Americans generally have more opportunity than ever before, many spokesmen for black communities stress that no gains short of full equality can be entirely sufficient. In this context, it is important to know about and understand the attitudes of black youth who within a few years will be a significant part of the constituency of black leaders and will have an increasingly major role in the struggle for full equality. The best way to introduce this study of the attitudes of youth in black high schools in five cities is to quote from an earlier study of black students in Kansas City, Missouri conducted in the spring of 1968 by the Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education:

> The average student enrolled in these three high schools in the Kansas City, Missouri ghetto neither believes that the United States will be separated into sub-societies based on race nor supports the arguments of those who would like to see this happen. He is optimistic about the future in that he believes the opportunities open to him are either good or very good. His expectations on these matters apparently are not founded on faith in the good will of white Americans, since he does not feel he can trust most whites. On the other hand, he does not personally dislike the few white Americans whom he has had an opportunity to meet and get to know. He believes that housing, employment, educational health, transportation, police, recreational, and social welfare services or resources in his community are not very good. He is particularly dissatisfied with conditions regarding housing, employment, recreation, and social welfare, and he is frequently resentful of police officers whom he tends to see as unnecessarily intimidating or "bullying" toward the public. He believes that non-violent actions stressing education, hard work, orderly protest, and improvement of communications between the races constitute the best means through which black people should try to achieve greater equality and prosperity, but he appears to be unconvinced that these non-violent means have done much good in the past and he is far from sure that he will not end up participating in a riot in the future. In general, then, he appears to be committed to goals involving the achievement of progress through cooperative means which probably would be endorsed by the great majority of his

> fellow Americans, but his perceptions of racial relationships and of the problems and conditions in the predominantly-Negro community in which he lives lead him to accept these ideals with a certain amount of skepticism and ambivalence. The discrepancy between the conditions he sees around him and his high hopes for the future is reflected in an underlying sense of unease and bitterness which leads some of his fellow students to accept the arguments of extreme militants who either reject the goals of an integrated society or believe that progress for black Americans can be achieved only through violent means. Sharing feelings of dissatisfaction and mistrust of whites which are widespread among his fellow students, he is not completely sure that these arguments are incorrect and he does not find it difficult to visualize himself swept up in violent confrontations which might originate either as protests within Negro communities or in attacks directed against the people who live there. At the present time it is impossible to predict whether separatist sentiments or propensities to reject non-violence as an ineffective political philosophy will remain at their current relatively insignificant level or will increase among students who will enter predominantly-black high schools in Kansas City during the next few years.[1]

Given the importance of topics explored in our 1968 study of black youth in a single major city, we believed it was desirable to conduct a follow-up study to accomplish two fundamental objectives: 1) determine whether or how the attitudes of Kansas City respondents resembled or differed from the attitudes of black youth in other parts of the United States; and 2) determine whether or how much change had occurred in the attitudes of Kansas City youth in a two-year period between the spring of 1968 and the spring of 1970.

In the original proposal for this follow-up study submitted to the National Institute of Mental Health in October of 1969 and described in the present report, we delineated plans to obtain samples of students in all-black or nearly all-black high schools in a number of cities selected to highlight differences that might be associated with size of city and region of the country. Originally, we planned to obtain samples from at least two large cities and two medium-sized cities in each of the following sections of the United States: East Coast; Upper Midwest-Great Lakes; Lower Midwest-Southwest; Deep South; and West Coast. Each sample was to consist of 160 respondents stratified so as to include equal numbers of males and females; tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders; and members of lower socioeconomic ("underclass") families as compared with members of working class families.

Unfortunately, however, we were not able to proceed according to these initial plans. When contacts were made in target cities where we knew educators who were in a position to help arrange to collect data for the study, a variety of obstacles were encountered which prevented us from obtaining the desired data. In most cases the obstacle consisted of administrative refusal to allow collection of data. Generally these refusals were accompanied with expressions of regret and descriptions of recent interracial conflict which made topics involving social attitudes in general and interracial attitudes in particular an even more sensitive matter than is usually the case. In one state refusals reflected state laws which were interpreted as prohibiting a study utilizing student responses to our questionnaire, and in several instances school district policies prohibited local educators from cooperating with us.

---

[1] Norman S. Fiddmont and Daniel U. Levine, "The Attitudes of Negro High School Students in Kansas City, Missouri: A Preliminary Report." (Kansas City, Missouri: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, n.d.) (mimeo), p.22.

In addition, data from the schools in which we eventually did collect information did not allow us to constitute our individual-school samples with N's of 160 as described above, primarily because there generally was too narrow a distribution of respondents of both sexes across grade levels and social classes. The consequences of this outcome for the research methodology used in the study are described in the next chapter.

After considerable effort and many communications with school officials and other contact persons in various parts of the country, a sample of five schools was obtained from as many cities. Data were obtained during the spring of 1970[2] with a questionnaire which was a modification of the one we had used in Kansas City in 1968. Except for Kansas City, the cities in which the schools in the sample are located will not be identified by name in accordance with guarantees we made that the anonymity of cities would be protected along with that of participating schools and students. The five cities for which data on the attitudes of students in all black or nearly all-black high schools were obtained are as follows:

> Kansas City, Missouri: Kansas City is a lower midwestern-upper southewestern city of nearly 500,000 population in a metropolitan area of approximately 1,250,000. As part of a border state in which slavery was legal before the Civil War, Kansas City followed the southern pattern of de jure school segregation until the Supreme Court outlawed this practice in 1954. Although school segregation is no longer mandated by law, the majority of black students in Kansas City continue to attend segregated schools in segregated neighborhoods, despite a few token efforts the school district made in the early 1960's to encourage desegregation. In 1970 approximately 75% of the black students in Kansas City, Missouri schools attended schools which were 90% or more black. The Negro population constitutes 23% of the total city population and 50% of the population of the largest public school district in the city. For the present study, data were collected from students in one of the three predominantly-black high schools which were included in our 1968 study.
>
> Eastern City: The second city included in the sample is one of the largest cities on the east coast. Negroes

---

[2] The questionnaire used in the study is shown in Appendix A.

constitute nearly 35% of the total city population and approximately sixty percent of the public school enrollment in this city. An estimated 70% of the black pupils in Eastern City public schools attend schools which are virtually all black.

Deep South City: The deep south school included in the sample is located in a very small city of several thousand people. About 50 percent of the city population and 85 percent of the public school population is Negro. We have no reason to believe that this city is either typical or atypical of other small cities in the deep south.

Upper Midwestern City: The fourth school in our sample is located in a very large city in the upper midwestern-Great Lakes region and has one of the largest populations of black residents in the nation. Approximately 33% of the people in the city and 55 percent of the students in the public schools are black. This city is often cited, both locally and nationally, as having one of the highest if not the highest rate of residential as well as public school segregation in the United States. More than ninety percent of the black students who attend public elementary schools in Upper Midwestern City are enrolled in schools which are nearly all Negro.

Lower Midwestern City: Lower Midwestern City has a population 20% larger than Kansas City. Like Kansas City, this city is located in a border state where de jure segregation existed in the schools until 1954. More than twice as many black people live in Lower Midwestern City as in Kansas City. The metropolitan area of Lower Midwestern City is much larger than the Kansas City SMSA, as is the percentage of black citizens within the city population. Approximately 40% of the residents of Lower Midwestern City and 70% of the public school students are black. Eighty-five percent of the black pupils in public schools in Lower Midwestern City are in all black schools. These facts imply that the black ghetto in Lower Midwestern City is much larger than its counterpart in Kansas City.

Because the sample of cities is so small, the results of the study must be viewed as exploratory and suggestive of further research rather than as in any sense definitive findings concerning the attitudes of black youth in differing types of cities. Nevertheless, to our knowledge little systematic information of the kind reported in this study has been available for even a small sample of three or four cities, partly because it is extremely difficult to obtain access to large enough numbers of respondents to conduct this type of study. For this reason, we believe the results are worth serious attention from anyone interested in understanding or conducting further research on the topics explored in the study.

I. Methods and Procedures

Collection of Data

The questionnaire used to collect data in this study was based on an instrument developed to assess the attitudes of students at three predominantly black high schools in Kansas City, Missouri in 1968. A number of the items used in the previous study were re-worded or otherwise refined to improve readability and several items were changed from open-ended to multiple-choice in order to facilitate processing of the data. Copies of the revised questionnaire were professionally printed in sufficient quantity to allow for distribution in batches of three to four hundred in as many as fifteen schools. The final set of items together with information on revisions in the original 1968 questionnaire and on the responses of students in the total sample and the Kansas City subsample is shown in Table 1.

Questionnaires were administered in the Spring of 1970 at the five high schools at which school officilas had agreed to cooperate in the study. (Information on the five cities in which these schools are located is provided in the introductory section above and will not be repeated in this chapter.) In each school questionnaires were distributed and collected by contact persons whom we had good reason to believe maintained cordial and respectful relationships with students and had the confidence of both the student body and the staff.[2] Respondents were explicitly instructed that they should not provide any information that might allow for personal identification and were assured that nothing would be done to bring discredit or disfavor on their schools.

It should be particularly noted that some of the items on our questionnaire were open-ended questions which students were requested to answer in their own words. The advantage of this procedure is that students' responses are not influenced or guided one way or another by response categories such as are used on items which request respondents to choose among a list of specific alternatives. Thus an open-ended question generally is more likely to yield unbiased information concerning the original feelings and understandings of respondents than is a multiple-choice question. Using open-ended questions is especially appropriate in studies such as the present one in which attitudes being investigated have strong emotional connotations that may be magnified by the wording of multiple-choice responses, thereby leading to inaccuracies in assessing the underlying nature of these attitudes. The disadvantage of this procedure is that open-ended answers must be laboriously classified in order to identify commonalities in the viewpoints of the population under study. Other problems arise in determining whether open-ended answers have been reliably classified and in encouraging respondents to formulate and write out their own answers rather than to merely circle

---

[1] The exact form of the questionnaire as printed and distributed is shown in Appendix A.

[2] Because most respondents in the Kansas City sample knew one of the investigators and many were aware of his interest in topics included on the questionnaire, it is possible that some Kansas City respondents may have provided answers calculated to please him. However, we do not think this tendency was very widespread in view of the great pains taken to impress respondents with the importance of providing honest answers and the consistency of responses noted in batches of questionnaires from respondents who were more and less acquainted with the investigator.

TABLE 1

Comparison Between Percentage Distributions of Responses of Black Students in 1968 Kansas City Sample, 1970 Kansas City Sample, and the Total 1970 Sample from Five Cities Including Kansas City

(Due to rounding, some percentage distributions do not add to 100)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
1. What do you think is the most important reason why some black citizens have engaged in violence?** ***			
To gain equal rights	42	51	60
To gain revenge	16	17	12
To cover up for looting	02	05	03
Out of ignorance or stupidity	16	10	07
Due to lack of opportunity	16	11	13
Other	08	05	05
2. What does the term "ghetto" mean to you? (open-ended)**			
Overcrowded slums, poverty		70	65
A part of the city where a minority group lives		11	09
Area where violence often occurs		00	02
Black neighborhood	Not Applicable	11	07
Concentration camp, prison, reservation or restricted area		01	10
A cool place; soul country; a way of living or thinking		04	03
An ignored part of the city		04	02
Other		00	02

---

*N's shown in the heading are for the entire sample. N's vary considerably on individual items where there were blanks or incorrect responses. On some items the numbers of blanks were substantial. To facilitate comparisons the percentages of blank responses usually are omitted in Table 1.

**On items marked with a double asterisk, the wording of a question and/or the response categories used in 1968 were modified in 1970.

***On items marked with a triple asterisk, questions which were open-ended in 1968 were changed to fixed-category in 1970. Items in Table 1 show the 1970 wording and response categories, with adjustments made where appropriate to make the 1968 data comparable to the 1970 data.

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
3. Do you feel you live in a ghetto? (open-ended)			
Yes	22	45	38
No	57	54	61
Unsure or undecided	21	01	01
4. Do you think your neighbors feel safe in your neighborhood?			
Almost all the time	27	19	22
Most of the time	50	49	42
Not usually	10	14	14
Seldom	05	09	09
Very seldom	06	10	10
No response	01	01	03
5. About what percentage of whites do you feel you can trust? (open-ended)			
0-10%	37	46	66
11-20%	06	08	07
21-30%	10	16	08
31-40%	08	04	03
41-50%	14	11	09
51-75%	26	10	04
76% or more		04	03
6. How many white people would you say you know well? (open-ended)			
0	19	32	40
1	41	09	08
2	16	07	07
3 or 4	13	03	05
5 or 6	06	15	10
7 or more	05	34	28

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
7. Do you like the average white person you have met?			
Almost all	19	14	09
Most	21	24	16
Some	27	30	28
A few	19	20	27
Hardly any	08	07	09
None	05	05	07
No response	00	00	03
8. Do you think our country will be separated into two nations, one black and one white?			
Certain	02	01	03
Almost certain	04	02	03
Probably	21	14	18
Probably not	20	32	29
Very unlikely	50	51	44
No response	02	01	03
9. Do you feel this would be desirable or undesirable?			
Very desirable	08	02	04
Desirable	06	05	10
Unsure	25	35	36
Undesirable	29	33	29
Very undesirable	31	25	21

TABLE I (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
10. Do you think it is possible that you might ever find yourself participating in a riot?**			
Yes, very possible	Not applicable	18	17
Yes, it could happen		32	31
Yes, but it isn't probable		10	11
Unsure		13	16
No, it is unlikely		18	17
Impossible		09	07
11. If yes, under what conditions could this happen? (open-ended)**			
If I feel the cause is just	Not applicable	20	18
To get even with those who mistreat black people		03	06
As a way of overcoming oppression and injustice		29	27
Because it is part of the revolution		04	07
Going along with a crowd		08	07
Injury against self, family, or property		18	14
Depends on circumstance		09	12
To steal and loot		00	02
Other		09	08
12. Have you ever been in trouble with the police?***			
Never	75	77	81
Once	13	11	09
Sometimes	11	09	06
Often		01	01
Very often		03	02

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
13. How would you describe your attitudes toward the police?**			
Very favorable	Not applicable	04	04
Favorable		26	26
Not sure		41	33
Unfavorable		22	21
Very unfavorable		06	13
14. Explain your answer (open-ended)			
Negative			
Police are bullies	Not applicable	18	19
Police are prejudiced, disrespectful, or unfair to black people		18	26
Police are pigs		14	15
Police do not offer protection when needed, have questionable character		26	24
I hate police		08	04
Police treat all blacks like criminals		02	01
I don't trust them		02	04
Other		12	06
Positive			
They are human too	Not applicable	09	06
They have a job to do		15	17
We need them		17	17
Some are OK		31	32
They don't bother me		19	17
They are important even though prejudiced		05	04
Other		04	07

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
15. Do you think there are serious problems in getting a job in your city?**			
Very serious	58	23	36
Moderately serious		33	28
Not very serious	42	37	30
Not serious at all		07	07
16. Explain your answer			
Very serious or Moderately serious			
Racial discrimination	Not applicable	45	45
Lack of educational and technical skills		17	15
Limited experience		00	03
Few available		09	11
Too much red tape		01	01
Age discrimination		11	07
Clothing and hairstyles		00	01
Only menial and low-paying available		06	06
Other		11	10
Not very serious - Not serious at all			
With education and technical skills	Not applicable	38	44
With desire to improve good habits		05	05
Nixon Administration policy		00	00
Strikes		02	01
But work may not be challenging		08	05
Training for better jobs now available		03	03
Help available from local youth employment agencies		03	02
But racial discrimination exists		15	12
Easily available for those willing to work		27	28

1-1f

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
17. What does "Black Power" mean to you? (open-ended)**			
All power to the people		07	08
Power to control and influence the destiny of the black community	22	16	11
More black political representation		02	02
Black capitalism		03	04
Total equality and freedom to do what whites do		17	22
Black takeover or rule of the country and world		05	05
Black unity and pride	18	14	22
Soul power - do your thing		03	04
Showing white people we are not scared anymore and fighting for what we want		10	06
Just a word; nothing; confusion; foolishness	15	16	09
Being black and beautiful		02	01
Violence against whites; riots; trouble		00	00
Other	45	04	05
18. How do you feel about the ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people?**			
Agree very much	29	23	21
Agree much	12	15	16
Agree a little	37	29	25
Disagree	09	09	10
Disagree very much	07	04	09
No opinion	12	20	18

1-19

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
19. What do you think are the three most important things needed to achieve the goals of black people? (Circle three)** ***			
Develop personal pride		14	13
Peaceful demonstration and protest		03	03
Education		24	23
Guerilla warfare		~~10~~ 00	~~07~~ 01
Individual determination to succeed		~~00~~ 10	~~01~~ 07
Political power	Not Applicable	07	08
Retaliation against white racism		02	02
Better understanding and communications		15	12
Whites must accept blacks as equals		18	17
Pass and implement civil rights laws		02	03
No response		05	10
20. Do you think the problems between blacks and whites will be solved in a peaceful and constructive way?**			
Very definitely	08	02	02
Definitely		03	04
Probably	51	45	32
Probably not	22	34	38
Definitely not	19	16	23
21. Do you think schools in the north will be integrated?**			
Very likely	24	14	24
Likely	37	38	37
Unlikely	07	11	08
Very unlikely	04	05	07
Unsure	24	32	24

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
22. If you answered "Very likely" or "Likely," how many years do you think it will take?** ***			
1-2		14	24
3-4	~~35~~ 86	26	21
5-10		51	38
11-15	~~02~~ 06	04	03
16-20		00	02
21 or more	~~03~~ 08	05	07
23. Do you feel your opportunities for the future are good?**			
Very good	23	21	20
Good	49	59	55
Mediocre	23	19	20
Poor	05	01	04
Very poor	02	01	01
24. What is the one biggest problem holding black people back in your city? (open-ended)**			
Racial discrimination	Not applicable	22	25
Lack of job opportunities		05	07
Laziness or other bad habits		03	03
Lack of education or skills		35	30
Lack of ambition		01	02
Lack of ability		01	00
Lack of confidence in self		01	02
Lack of political influence		00	001
Too little demand for rights		04	03
Not enough cooperation with whites		00	02
Distrust or hate of whites		01	03
Lack of unity or violence among blacks		16	14
Other		10	11

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
25. What would you say are the two most important reasons why some of your fellow students do poorly in school? (check two)			
Lack of preparation	17	17	16
Unreasonable requirements	06	05	09
Lack of ability	14	12	11
Lack of support at home	29	25	22
Lack of studying	54	45	39
Teachers don't understand	18	21	22
Lack of ambition	25	29	25
Poor teaching	16	19	18
Lack of equipment	20	21	31
26. In your opinion, how adequate is housing for black people in your city?			
Very good	03	01	03
Good	14	15	12
Mediocre	37	40	33
Poor	31	40	36
Very poor	15	03	16
27. In your opinion, how adequate are employment sources for black people in your city?			
Very good	03	03	02
Good	17	26	22
Mediocre	41	48	38
Poor	29	21	28
Very poor	10	02	10

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
28. In your opinion, how adequate is education for black people in your city?			
Very good	09	07	~~02~~ 05
Good	30	27	~~33~~ 16
Mediocre	31	39	~~45~~ 22
Poor	20	23	~~16~~ 33
Very poor	09	04	~~04~~ 24
29. In your opinion, how adequate are health services for black people in your city?			
Very good	09	06	06
Good	34	33	36
Mediocre	38	41	32
Poor	14	18	21
Very poor	05	02	05
30. In your opinion, how adequate is transportation for black people in your city?			
Very good	14	11	08
Good	38	40	35
Mediocre	32	29	31
Poor	10	16	18
Very poor	06	04	08
31. In your opinion, how adequate are police services for black people in your city?			
Very good	03	02	03
Good	12	17	17
Mediocre	22	25	25
Poor	29	34	30
Very poor	34	21	25

1-1k

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1970 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
32. In your opinion, how adequate is recreation for black people in your city?			
Very good	07	06	05
Good	18	23	16
Mediocre	25	26	22
Poor	30	25	33
Very poor	20	21	24
33. In your opinion, how adequate are welfare services for black people in your city?			
Very good	07	06	07
Good	19	17	17
Mediocre	30	38	34
Poor	23	24	23
Very poor	19	16	19
34. If the situation arose, would you be willing to live in an integrated neighborhood?			
Definitely	26	23	19
Probably	26	34	30
Maybe	33	34	37
Probably not	08	05	07
Definitely not	06	04	07
35. How desirable do you think it is to achieve integrated housing?			
Very undesirable	14	07	11
Somewhat undesirable	26	25	25
Not particularly desirable	31	40	39
Desirable	20	22	19
Very desirable	09	05	06

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
36. How good a student are you?			
One of the best students in my class	15	13	17
Above the middle of my class	30	29	31
In the middle of my class	50	53	47
Below the middle of my class	03	04	04
Near the bottom of my class	02	01	01
37. Good luck is more important than hard work for success			
Agree very much	04	05	07
Agree	10	03	06
Not sure	17	17	17
Disagree	42	40	36
Disagree very much	28	34	34
38. People like me don't have a chance to be successful**			
Agree very much	03	02	03
Agree	05	02	07
Not sure	17	14	14
Disagree	50	42	40
Disagree very much	24	41	36
39. My experience has made [illegible] feel that life is not worth living			
Never	34	35	~~39~~ 34
Rarely	18	21	~~16~~ 14
Once in a while	23	20	~~21~~ 19
Sometimes	17	18	~~19~~ 16
Often	04	06	~~05~~ 04
Very Often	03	01	02

1-1m

TABLE I (Cont'd.)

Item and response categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
40. I feel a sense of pride and accomplishment as a result of the kind of person I am			
Very often	35	23	31
Often	30	34	28
Sometimes	25	34	29
Seldom	07	06	08
Very seldom	03	02	04
41. Have your opinions on the topics in this questionnaire generally changed in the last few years?**			
Very much	Not Applicable	08	12
Much		10	09
Some		38	31
A little		30	28
Not at all		14	20
42. If you said your opinions have changed, how would you describe this change?			
Much more optimistic	Not Applicable	14	17
Somewhat more optimistic		26	24
A little more optimistic		16	17
A little more pessimistic		09	07
Somewhat more pessimistic		11	07
Much more pessimistic		02	04
None of these terms fit		21	23

1-1n

TABLE I (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
43 ~~44~~. Please explain your answer (open ended)			
Because of more pride or awareness or knowledge of social issues		36	37
Opportunities for improving race relations are greater		00	03
Too few social and economic improvements have occurred		16	10
Race relations are getting worse; blacks and whites can't get along	Not applicable	09	06
Opportunities for improving one's self are available		02	02
Because of recent changes in the country		13	09
Because of the Black Power movement		07	03
Things are gradually getting better		13	15
Other		04	13
44 ~~45~~. What groups do you feel are doing the most to help black people (open-ended)			
Black Panthers (or Sons of Malcolm)		27	42
Black Youth of America		01	00
SCLC		11	26
SNCC		03	01
CORE		06	03
Black Muslims		01	07
NAACP		47	42
Youth Groups		07	08
Black Economic Union	Not applicable	24	06
Church Groups		02	01
Peace Corps and VISTA		01	01
Urban League		03	02
Government housing agencies		05	02
Government employment agencies		10	03
LEAP		02	01
NYC		05	02
MACE		00	00
Local industrial development agency		00	10
Media		10	01
		N = 188 responses from 136 respondents	N = 1195 responses from 573 respondents

TABLE 1 (Cont'd.)

Item and Response Categories	Kansas City 1968 N = 529*	Kansas City 1970 N = 188	Five Cities 1970 N = 759
45 ~~46.~~ In what way are these groups doing the most to help black people? (Circle one or more)			
Bringing black people together	Not applicable	47****	51
Influencing the government		18	14
Telling the man off		10	11
Helping set up black business		51	47
Helping to find jobs		57	52
Encouraging education		41	44
Developing black pride		46	49
Other		03	05

****Percentages of all subjects in sample.

1-1p

an item on a checklist. The latter problem often is particularly acute among students who may have difficulty expressing themselves and may be disinclined to fill out a long questionnaire. In the present study we used multiple-choice items wherever it was thought this was feasible without appreciably reducing the accuracy or adequacy of the data and retained the open-ended format for items on which we felt it could be misleading to provide cues that might lead to biased responses.

Previous research we had conducted with samples of students from black high schools had shown that inter-rater reliabilities in categorizing responses on the open-ended items ranged from 67 to 91%, with most between 74 and 85 percent. For the present study, four raters independently sorted responses on the open-ended items from a random sample of 100 questionnaires into response categories which had been established after considerable study by one of the investigators. Inter-rater reliability using this procedure was 87 percent.

Inasmuch as split-half methods were not appropriate to the questionnaire and it was impossible to obtain a repeated (identifiable) administration of the questionnaire for even a part of the sample, we have no data on the reliability of the multiple-choice items. However, the relatively high degree of consistency (described in later chapters) which was found to characterize responses across the five cities provides an indication that the instrument as a whole probably is adequate in reliability, especially since the questions and the types of responses requested are straightforward and on their face seem susceptible to relatively little misinterpretation or wavering on the part of respondents.[3]

Background and status variables

After questionnaires which contained mostly blank responses had been discarded, each respondent's social-class placement was determined with Hollingshead's Two-Factor Index utilizing information on the occupation and education of a respondent's father, mother (if data are not available on the father), or head of household. Students in the five subsamples were distributed as follows by grade level, sex, and social class:

---

[3] Relatively large numbers of blank responses were found in questionnaires from several schools in the study, but few questionnaires had to be discarded because a respondent did not answer most of the items or did not appear to be treating the questionnaire seriously. Except where otherwise indicated, calculations shown in Table 1 and elsewhere in this study do not include non-respondents on a given item.

	Grade Level						Sex				Social Class[4]					
	10		11		12		M		F		I-III		IV		V	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Kansas City	37	(69)	36	(67)	28	(52)	47	(89)	53	(99)	19	(31)	43	(69)	38	(60)
Eastern City	-	-	26	(53)	74	(150)	27	(54)	73	(149)	05	(9)	38	(65)	56	(95)
Deep South City	32	(66)	34	(69)	34	(69)	50	(101)	50	(103)	01	(1)	29	(50)	71	(123)
Upper Midwestern City	-	-	65	(64)	35	(35)	51	(50)	49	(49)	09	(6)	33	(23)	59	(41)
Lower Midwestern City	55	(36)	45	(29)	-	-	40	(26)	60	(39)	36	(14)	38	(15)	26	(10)
Total sample	23	(171)	37	(282)	40	(306)	42	(320)	58	(439)	10	(61)	36	(222)	54	(329)

Effects of background and status variables

Scores on measures of occupation, education, and social class may have differing meanings in various communities, particularly when one is comparing communities as diverse as a large northern city and a small rural-oriented, southern city. For example, high school graduation may signify a relatively low level of attainment and prestige in one community and a relatively high level in another. In a community in which occupational and educational attainment are very low, similarly, Social Class IV on a five-point scale may signify relatively high social status as compared with a similar placement in a community with a wider distribution of educational and occupational attainment. For this reason, each respondent was given two scores showing whether his mother and father were above the respective medians for paternal and maternal educational attainments among respondents in his own school. These data made it possible to explore the question of whether students in any one city whose mothers or fathers were relatively high on educational attainment differed in their responses on attitude items from students in the same city whose mothers or fathers were relatively low on this component of social status.

Because there is some reason to believe that families - particularly black families - in which the mother has more education than the father may differ in important respects from families in which the father is more highly educated or both parents have equal educational attainment, a check was made to determine whether this consideration would have to be taken into account in analyzing the data. This was done by selecting subgroups of respondents from KansasCity and Eastern City whose families differed according to whether the mother or father had higher educational attainment and comparing their responses on fifteen selected attitude items on the questionnaires. Visual inspection of the data indicated that in more than 90% of these comparisons there were no differences in the distributions of responses for the two subgroups within a city differing on paternal vs. maternal education. Thus it was concluded that there was no need to sort respondents into separate groups based on how much education their mothers had attained relative to their fathers.

---

[4] Category V is low and category I is high in social class. Due to lack of information with which to determine social-class placement, some respondents could not be placed in one of the social-class categories.

As noted above, our samples of students from five cities varied widely on such background and status variables as grade level in school and social class. Because it was possible that responses to the attitude items might be correlated with such background and status variables, differences among the five samples in response patterns on the attitude items might be due primarily to differences in their composition rather than to real differences in attitudes from city to city.

To investigate this possibility, Pearson Product-moment correlations and point biserial correlations were computed between the background and status variables on the one hand and the numerically-scored attitude items on the other.[5] Each background or status variable was correlated separately with fourteen attitude items. The background and status variables were the following:

Grade level in school (grades 10, 11, and 12)
Sex
Mother's Education (dichotomous)
Social Class (five categories determined by Hollingshead's
Two-Factor Index)

For the total sample of students from schools in five cities, only two of the 56 correlations between a status or background variable on the one hand and an attitude item on the other was as high as .10.[6] For the sample as a whole, therefore, we can say that there were few instances in which grade level in school, sex, mother's education, or social class could account for as much as one percent of the variance in responses to the attitude items. Given this lack of correlation between background and status variables and responses to the attitude items and assuming that the associations between the background and attitude items are linear, we are relatively safe in comparing schools without worrying that the differences we find in attitudes may be caused by differences in the composition of the subsamples.

However, to double check on the relation between background and status variables and attitude responses we also computed separate correlations for the individual subsamples. At this point we chose to disregard most correlations less than .20, since a correlation less than this magnitude does not allow use of one variable to predict more than four percent of the variance in the other. While this decision necessarily is somewhat arbitrary, we did not believe that background and status variables correlated .20 or less with the attitude items could account to any appreciable extent for attitude differences found between schools.

---

[5] Correlations involving the dichotomous variables were point biserial correlations; the others were product-moment correlations.

[6] The two exceptions were that a correlation of .13 was found between grade level in school and attitudes toward the police and a correlation of .14 was found between sex and expectations that problems between whites and blacks would be peacefully resolved. The former correlation was due primarily to a correlation of .37 in Upper Midwestern City, and the latter to correlations of .18 and .25 in Deep South City and Lower Midwestern City, respectively. Only 11 of the 56 correlations for the total sample were significant at the .05 level, even though the Ns on which these correlations were computed always were at least 500.

Less than six percent of the intra-school correlations were .20 or higher, and some of these can be attributed to chance occurrences in a set of correlations containing 280 correlations.[7] In addition, there was little or no consistency in the correlations found from school-to-school. For example, sex and perceptions of opportunities for the future correlated at .21 in Kansas City, but no correlations that high appeared in any other school. Similarly, grade level and attitudes toward the police correlated at .28 in Upper Midwestern City but the corresponding correlations did not reach .20 in the other four cities. These findings further support the conclusion that background and status variables among the students in our sample are not consistently related to responses on the attitude items.

At this point we could now proceed to process the data from our sample of 759 respondents from all-black or predominantly-black high schools in five cities and to make inter-city comparisons as well as inter-attitudinal analyses without being overly concerned that differences in background variables between subsamples in the five cities might call into question the validity of our findings.[8]

---

[7] Only 23 of the 280 intra-school correlations (56 X 5 schools) were significant at the .05 level, and only 5 were significant at the .01 level.

[8] However, to ensure caution in citing and interpreting possible differences among the five schools in our sample, we will use the .01 level in testing for differences involving any attitude variable that correlated .20 or higher with a background or status variable in a school involved in a given comparison with one or more other schools that differed noticeably on that particular background or status variable.

II. General Portrayal of Respondents in Northern Cities

In this section we will describe the "average" respondent in our sample by portraying the general levels of responses to questionnaire items. It is important to keep in mind that the material in this section is concerned only with the four northern cities and ignores a few differences (reported in a later section) on which Deep South City was found to differ from the other four cities. We will follow the order of items shown in Table 1 in drawing this portrayal of the general level of responses in the four northern cities. Unless otherwise indicated by the response categories shown in Table 1, students who did not respond to a particular item have not been included in calculating percentages used to make comparisons in this section or other parts of the report.

1. Between two-thirds and one-half of the students in each of the four cities said they thought the most important reason some black citizens had engaged in violence had been to gain equal rights.

2. A solid majority of students in the sample defined the term "ghetto" as a low-income, overcrowded, slum-type community.

3. A majority of students say they think their neighbors feel safe all or most of the time. As noted in a later section, however, the proportions of respondents who gave this answer in the two largest cities (Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City) were only slightly greater than the proportions who said their neighbors did not usually or seldom felt safe in their neighborhoods.

4. The majority of students felt they could trust only 0-20% of whites.

5. Just under half the students in our sample said they do not know more than a single white person well. (The percentages of respondents who gave this answer in the four cities varied from 41% in Kansas City to 62% in Upper Midwestern City; this is a relatively narrow range considering that the question was open-ended and the latitude in answering available to a respondent was quite wide.)

6. The majority of students in our sample said they liked "Some" or "A few" of the white persons they had met; less than one-fifth in any one city said they liked "Hardly any" or "None."

7. A sizable majority of students said it was not probable or was very unlikely that "our country will be separated into two nations, one black and one white."

8. No more than 21% of the students in any one city said it was desirable or very desirable that this type of separation should occur; however, this percentage varied from 21% in Upper Midwestern City to only 07% in Kansas City.

9. Between 35 and 50% of the respondents in the four northern cities marked "Yes, it could happen" or "Yes, very possible" in responding to the item, "Do you think it is possible you might ever find yourself participating in a riot?" In each of these cities at least a plurality of the respondents who gave an affirmative answer envisioned themselves as possibly being drawn into a riot "If I feel the cause is just" or "As a way of overcoming injustice and oppression."

10. In each of the four cities a large majority - from 73 to 89% - of the respondents said they had never been in trouble with the police.

11. As might have been expected given the depth of police-community problems in urban areas of the north, respondents tended to describe themselves as more unfavorable than favorable toward the police. The percentages of respondents who described themselves as unfavorable or very unfavorable toward the police varied from 28% in Kansas City to 50% in Eastern City; only in Kansas City did a slightly higher proportion of respondents select "Favorable" or "Very Favorable" than selected "Unfavorable" or "Very Unfavorable."

12. In explaining the basis for their attitudes toward the police, between one-fourth and one-third of the respondents in each city said the police do not offer protection when needed or have questionable ethics and between one-fifth and one-fourth claimed that the police are prejudiced, disrespectful, or inequitable toward black people.

13. In each of the four cities, the reason most commonly given by respondents who said they were favorable toward the police was that some police officers are "OK."

14. A majority of the students in each of the four cities said that the problems of getting a job in their city were "Very serious" or "Moderately serious." However, the percentages of students who gave this response ranged from 56% in Kansas City to 72% in Upper Midwestern City and Lower Midwestern City.

15. In each city the reason most commonly given for job problems being serious was racial discrimination in hiring; the reasons given by respondents who did not perceive job problems as serious generally were that jobs could be obtained by those who possessed education and technical skills or a strong desire to work.

This pattern suggests that respondents who perceive job problems as serious may be responding on a different basis or using a different definition than those who do not. Respondents who perceive much racial discrimination in hiring or are particularly concerned about such discrimination tend to believe there are serious problems finding employment. Respondents who believe that applicants can get at least low-level work whatever their race tend to perceive job problems as being less serious than the former group which seems more concerned with the effects of present or previous discrimination on black people's opportunities to obtain middle-level or high-paid jobs.

16. In each of the four cities two of the three most frequently-offered definitions of "Black Power" were classified under the headings "Total equality and freedom to do what whites do" and "Black unity and pride," except that Kansas City respondents did not offer this definition among their top three. Instead, Kansas City respondents defined Black Power as "Just a word; nothing; confusion; /or/ foolishness or as "Power to control and influence the destiny of the black community" about as often as they defined it in terms of equality and freedom or unity and pride. Lower Midwestern City students responded with the slogan "all power to the people" (or some variant of it) as often as they gave any other definition. In both Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City, the most frequent and second-most frequent definitions were "Black unity and pride" and "Total equality and freedom to do what whites do," respectively.

17. Less than one-fifth of our respondents disagreed with "the ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people." The percentages of respondents who "Disagreed" or "Disagreed very much" with such ideas were 13% in Kansas City and 20% in each of the other three cities.

18. In each of the four cities the response category most frequently selected in response to the item, "What do you think are the three most important things needed to achieve the goals of black people (circle three)" was "Education." The only other response categories which appeared among the three receiving as much as 10% of the citations in any one city were "Whites must accept blacks as equals," "Better understanding and communications," and "Develop personal pride." In each of the four cities responses focusing on peaceful initiative on the part of individual blacks (i.e., "Develop personal pride"; "Education"; and "Individual determination to succeed") were selected far more frequently than any other types of responses. (The percentages of responses in these categories varied from 37% in Upper Midwestern City to 52% in Lower Midwestern City.) In no city did the response categories "Peaceful demonstration and protest," "Retaliation against white racism," and "Geurilla warfare" together receive more than 10% of all citations.

19. A majority of respondents in each of the four cities felt that the problems between blacks and whites either probably would not or definitely would not "be solved in a peaceful and constructive way." The percentages varied from 50% in Kansas City to approximately two-thirds in the other three cities.

20. In each of the four cities a greater percentage of respondents said it was "Very likely" or "Likely" that schools in the north will be integrated in the future than said it was "Unlikely" or "Very unlikely." The percentages who said they thought it was likely schools in the north would be integrated varied from 48% in Upper Midwestern City to 64% in Lower Midwestern City. Among these groups, the percentages of respondents who thought that northern schools would be integrated within the next four years and the next ten years, respectively,were at least 32% and 73% in each of the four cities.

21. A large majority of respondents in each of the four cities, varying from 59% in Upper Midwestern City to 80% in Kansas City, said they felt their opportunities for the future were "Good" or "Very good."

22. By far the most commonly-cited problems given in responding to the item, "What is the one biggest problem holding black people back in your city?" were classified under the headings "Racial discrimination and "Lack of education or skills," except that only 12% of the respondents in Lower Midwestern City cited racial discrimination as compared with a minimum of 21% in each of the other three cities.

When respondents who cited reasons which could be considered unambiguously as "deficiencies" among individual black people (i.e., "Laziness or other bad habits"; "Lack of education or skills"; "Lack of ambition"; "Lack of ability"; and "Lack of confidence in self") were considered together, the percentages of respondents who gave this type of reason varied from 30% in Lower Midwestern City to 49% in Upper Midwestern City. In Kansas City, Eastern City, and Lower Midwestern City, these percentages were approximately equal to the percentages of respondents who offered the two unambiguously society-based reasons "Racial discrimination" and "Lack of job opportunities."

23. In each of the four cities, the reason most commonly selected in responding to the item, "What would you say are the two most important reasons why some of your fellow students do poorly in school?" was "Lack of studying." (Only in Upper Midwestern City, where 50% of the respondents who answered the question said "Teachers don't understand" and 48% said "Poor teaching," did respondents cite a school-related cause nearly as frequently as they attributed school failure to

lack of study on the part of their fellow students.)

24. In no city did more than 16% of the respondents rate housing facilities for black people in their city as "Good" or "Very good."

25. In no city did more than 30% of the respondents rate employment services for black people in their city as "Good" or "Very good."

26. In three of the four cities, more respondents rated education for black people in their city as "Mediocre" than selected any other response category; in Upper Midwestern City, more respondents selected "Poor" than any other response category.

27. In all four cities, more respondents rated transportation for black people in their city as "Good" or "Very good" than rated it "Poor" or "Very poor." In three of the four cities this pattern also held for health services.

28. In no city did as many as one-fifth of respondents rate police services for black people in their city as "Very good" or "Good." At least 55% in each of the four cities rated police services as "Poor" or "Very poor."

29. In each of the four cities the percentage of respondents who rated recreation services and facilities for black people in their city as "Poor" or "Very poor" was considerably higher than the percentage who rated recreation as "Good" and "Very good."

30. In each of the four cities the percentage of respondents who rated welfare services for black people in their city as "Poor" or "Very poor" was considerably higher than the percentage who rated welfare as "Good" or "Very good."

31. In no city did more than 21% of the respondents say they definitely would not or probably would not live in an integrated neighborhood if the situation arose; however, the percentages of respondents who said they either definitely or probably would be willing to live in an integrated neighborhood varied from 57% in Kansas City to 44% in Eastern City.

32. In each of the four cities the response most frequently selected in response to the item, "How desirable do you think it is to achieve integrated housing?" was "Not particularly desirable."

33. In each of the four cities, between forty and fifty percent of our respondents indicated that they either were "One of the best students in my class" or "Above the middle of my class." Inasmuch as a majority of our sample consists of eleventh and twelfth graders in schools with relatively high dropout rates, this pattern may represent an accurate reading of our respondents' school performance relative to all the fellow students who entered high school with them as well as a commonly-found tendency to slightly exaggerate one's standing compared with most other students in a high school.

34. The percentages of respondents who agreed with the item, "Good luck is more important than hard work for success" varied from 08% in Kansas City to 19% in Upper Midwestern City.

The percentages of respondents who agreed with the item, "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life" varied from 04% in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City to 18% in Upper Midwestern City.

The percentages of respondents who answered "Often" or "Very Often" in response to the item, "My experience has made me feel that life is not worth living" varied from 05% in Eastern City to 13% in Lower Midwestern City. In none of the four cities did as many as 40% of the respondents select the response categories "Sometimes," "Often," or "Very often."

The percentages of students who answered "Seldom" or "Very seldom" in response to the item, "I feel a sense of pride and accomplishment as a result of the kind of person I am" varied from 07% in Upper Midwestern City to 14% in Lower Midwestern City.

It should be noted that while we do not have data which would enable us to determine whether these response patterns are "high" or "low" in comparison with the attitudes of white students or youth from other ethnic groups, it is well established that items such as those cited above dealing with fate control and self-concept are very sensitive in predicting achievement levels and other attitudinal correlates among youth from differing groups. The well-known study on Equality of Educational Opportunity in the United States, for example, found that attitudes tapped by these types of items were more strongly related to achievement than all other types of "variables measured in the survey, including all measures of family background and all school variables . . ."[1] The survey also found that for minority but not majority white students, items dealing with fate control were better predictors of achievement than were those dealing with self concept as a learner. Two of the three items which the study used to measure sense of fate control among twelfth graders were the two we included on "Good luck is more important than hard work for success" and "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life." In this regard, it should be specially noted that respondents in Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City scored lower on these two items of fate control (i.e., more sense of powerlessness) than did respondents in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City.

35. The percentages of respondents who said their opinions on the topics dealt with in the questionnaires had changed "A little" or "None at all" in the past few years varied within a relatively narrow range from 34% in Kansas City to 41% in Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City. However, the percentages of respondents who said their opinions had changed "Very much" or "Much" varied from 17% in Upper Midwestern City to 32% in Lower Midwestern City.

Among respondents who said their opinions had changed, the percentages who said their opinions had become more optimistic varied within a relatively narrow range from 56% in Kansas City to 63% in Lower Midwestern City. The comparable percentages who said their opinions had become more pessimistic varied within a relatively narrow range from 22% in Kansas City to 13% in Eastern City. As can be inferred from the patterns described above, this means that the percentages of students who responded to the items asking about opinion change and said their views had become more optimistic or more pessimistic were roughly similar from city to city, with an average of 42% across the four cities reporting their view had become more optimistic, 12% reporting their views had become more pessimistic, and 04% reporting that "None of these terms fit."

---

[1] James S. Coleman, et. al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 319.

36. In each of the four cities, the answers respondents most frequently gave to explain why their opinions had changed in the past few years were classified under the heading "Because of more pride or awareness or knowledge of social issues." The percentages of respondents who explained why their opinions had changed and gave reasons in this category varied from 36% in Kansas City to 50% in Upper Midwestern City. However, it also should be noted that less than half the respondents who responded to the multiple-choice item on attitude change went on to respond to the open-ended request for an explanation, which was the last item on the questionnaire.

37. As described at greater length in another section of this report, the NAACP and the Black Panthers were cited far more often than other groups or organizations in response to the item, "What groups do you feel are doing the most to help black people?" Although a good deal of local variation appeared to be affecting response patterns from city to city, only in Upper Midwestern City (where the Southern Christian Leadership Conference was cited more frequently than the NAACP) and in Eastern City (where the SCLC was cited 61% as often as the NAACP) were third most frequently-cited organizations mentioned at least 50% as often as the NAACP and the Black Panthers.

Having reviewed the general level of response among students in the four non-southern cities included in our sample, we are now in a position to summarize the the attitudes of the "typical" respondent.

The average respondent, as revealed in our data, is distrustful of most whites and knows few or no white persons well, but he has positive feelings about some of the whites he has met. He neither believes that separation between the races will become complete nor supports such a development.

He has never been in trouble with the police but he thinks it is possible he might some day find himself participating in a riot if its roots appear to lie in injustice and oppression. At the present time he is unfavorable toward the police, primarily because he tends to see them as oppressive and/or unresponsive to the needs of black people. He believes employment problems are serious in his city, partly because of racial discrimination. He is favorably disposed toward the concept of Black Power, which he defines in terms of achieving equality, freedom, and racial pride. Although he sees the use of violence among some black people as motivated primarily by an intention to gain equal rights, he rejects violence in favor of acquiring education and skills and developing better interracial relations. At the same time, he is apprehensive about the future of relations between the races, although he is optimistic about his own opportunities for the future.

He is not sure whether the problems of black people are due more to internal difficulties in taking advantage of opportunities or to discrimination and other forces in the larger society. As regards his local neighborhood, he rates services and facilities in housing, employment, education, law enforcement, recreation, and welfare as poor or mediocre. However, he does not feel he lives in a ghetto, which he defines as a low-income slum for the very poor. If he lives in a large, non-border city, he finds that many of his neighbors do not feel physically safe, and he is more inclined to feel fatalistic and powerless about his life than is his counterpart in smaller, border cities.

Although he would be willing to live in an integrated neighborhood, he does not believe that integrated housing is particularly important. His views on topics investigated in our questionnaire either have not changed very much in the past few years or have tended to become more optimistic as a result of a heightening racial and social awareness he perceives among black people. In general, he believes that the NAACP and the Black Panthers have been the most outstanding organizations working for improvement in the lives of black people, though he may also recognize the contributions of other prominent organizations if any are active in his community.

In sum, we could have done no better in drawing this portrayal of the average respondent in the non-southern cities in our sample than to have repeated the description from an earlier Kansas City study with which we began this report (see pp. I-1). The fact that the orientations of the average respondent in the four cities in 1970 were generally similar to the orientations of Kansas City students in 1968 underlines the relatively close agreement which seems to characterize the attitudes of black youth in many cities across the United States.

III. Support for Organizations

In order to determine which organizations and groups were viewed most favorably by students in our sample, respondents were asked to answer the item, "What groups do you feel are doing the most to help black people?" To avoid influencing the responses, the item was left open-ended, with five lines provided to write in the names of as many groups. Although this procedure probably resulted in more non-responses than would have been the case if an item with a list of groups to circle or check had been used, placing the item as the first substantive question on the questionnaire minimized the problem by encouraging a high rate of response. The percentage of respondents who wrote in the name of at least one group was a relatively high 76%. Organizations and groups cited by the respondents are shown in Table 2. Because many respondents cited more than one organization, the total number of citations shown in Table 2 is much more than the study N of 759.[1]

The most striking finding shown in Table 2 is the degree to which citations were limited to only three groups. The NAACP, with 319 citations, and the Black Panthers, with 318 citations, were the only two groups cited by more than half the students who responded to the item. By way of contrast, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference was cited by 198 respondents (35%), and the next highest category, which consisted of miscellaneous youth-oriented groups in each city, received only 58 citations. Together, the NAACP, the Black Panthers, and the SCLC received 70% of all the citations.

Regional and local variations in groups cited as "doing the most to help black people" are very evident in the response patterns shown in Table 2. For example, the SCLC was cited significantly more often in Deep South City and Upper Midwestern City than in the other three cities ($X^2 = 90.81$; df = 1; p .001) - a predictable finding in view of the fact that it is basically a southern organization which has been active in few northern cities other than Upper Midwestern City. Similarly, the Black Panthers were cited most often in Upper Midwestern City, where they have been very active and won a great deal of sympathy when some of their leaders were slaughtered in a police raid, and least often in Kansas City, where the local chapter has been so relatively unsuccessful that some of its leaders organized a new group called the Sons of Malcolm. Another perhaps predictable variation was seen in the fact that support for the NAACP apparently is related to southern location, as might be expected in view of that organization's record of leadership in the civil rights drive: the NAACP was cited significantly more frequently in Deep South City than in the two cities in border states ($X^2 = 8.02$; df = 1; $p < .005$), and significantly more frequently in the latter two cities than in Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City ($X^2 = 40.87$; df = 1; $p < .001$)

Other examples of locally-important conditions were apparent in Eastern City, where 18% of the respondents cited an economic-development project led by a local minister, and in Kansas City, where fully one-third of the respondents cited the Black Economic Union, which was given much local impetus by nationally-known as well as locally-prominent black athletes.

---

[1] The patterns reported in this section were essentially no different when answers were analyzed in terms of the first choices offered in response to the item rather than including all the citations of respondents who named more than one organization.

TABLE 2

Percentages and Numbers of Respondents Citing Specific Organizations, Agencies, and Groups in Response to the Item, "What groups do you feel are doing the most to help black people?", by City*

Organization Agency, or Group	Kansas City (N = 136) %	(N)	Eastern City (N = 129) %	(N)	Deep South City (N = 188) %	(N)	Upper Midwestern City (N = 77) %	(N)	Lower Midwestern City (N = 43) %	(N)	Totals (N = 573) %	(N)
Black Panthers**	37	(50)	62	(80)	60	(113)	69	(53)	53	(23)	55	(318)
SCLC	15	(20)	28	(36)	47	(89)	61	(47)	14	(6)	35	(198)
SNCC	04	(6)	02	(2)	01	(1)	03	(2)	00	(0)	02	(11)
CORE	09	(12)	01	(1)	02	(3)	00	(0)	07	(3)	03	(19)
Black Muslims	01	(2)	12	(15)	20	(8)	01	(1)	02	(1)	10	(56)
NAACP	65	(88)	46	(59)	64	(120)	34	(26)	60	(26)	56	(319)
Youth groups	10	(13)	13	(17)	03	(5)	17	(13)	23	(10)	10	(58)
Black Economic Union	33	(45)	00	(0)	00	(0)	00	(0)	00	(0)	08	(45)
Church Groups	03	(4)	03	(4)	01	(1)	01	(1)	00	(0)	02	(10)
Urban League	04	(5)	05	(5)	02	(3)	04	(3)	12	(5)	03	(16)
Government housing agencies	07	(10)	02	(3)	01	(1)	01	(1)	00	(0)	03	(15)
Government employment agencies	14	(19)	00	(0)	01	(2)	03	(2)	00	(0)	04	(23)
Neighborhood Youth Corps	07	(9)	00	(0)	00	(0)	01	(1)	09	(4)	02	(14)
Other	07	(9)	30	(39)	23	(44)	04	(3)	00	(0)	17	(95)

*Percentages in this table are based on the number of students in a school who responded to the item.

**Or Sons of Malcolm in Kansas City

Another notable pattern in Table 2 is that only 2% of the respondents cited church groups (excepting the SCLC and the Black Muslims) as "doing the most to help black people" and only 3% cited the Urban League. The latter organization, however, was cited by 12% of the respondents in Upper Midwestern City, where the League's long-time director had been very well known and had gained a national reputation for his work there.

It was interesting to find that 20% of the respondents in Deep South City cited the Black Muslims, but, as noted elsewhere, this response possibly reflects an exaggerated conception of the Muslims' importance in the north rather than an assessment of their activity in Deep South City itself.

One other notable finding in Table 2 is that 14% of the respondents in Kansas City cited government employment agencies as doing much to help black people, as compared with less than 1% of the respondents in the other four cities. We have no way of knowing, however, whether this difference indicates that governmental employment-oriented agencies actually are more effective in Kansas City than the other cities or whether it reflects differential success in public relations efforts.

In addition to identifying groups which are doing the most to help black people, respondents also were asked to indicate, "In what way are these groups doing most to help black people?" Of the seven response categories provided (see Table 1), five were chosen by 40 percent or more of the respondents in the total sample. These five response categories were as follows: "bringing black people together"; "helping set up black business"; "helping to find jobs"; "encouraging education"; and "developing black pride." No response category was chosen, however, by more than 52 percent of the students in the overall sample or more than 64 percent of the students in any one school. This pattern suggests that black youth tend to be relatively consistent from city to city in their perceptions of the kinds of actions which are being undertaken to help black people. In the opinion of our respondents, these actions do not include "telling the man off" and "influencing the government"; only 11 percent and 14%, respectively chose these two categories.

Since the NAACP and the Black Panthers were cited far more often than any other group as "doing the most to help black people," we carried out an additional analysis to determine whether these two organizations were perceived as making differing sorts of contributions to the welfare of black people. To do this students who cited only the NAACP or only the Black Panthers were compared with respect to responses to the item asking respondents to specify "in what ways these groups are doing most to help black people." These comparisons showed that respondents who cited the Black Panthers were more likely to select the categories "telling the man off" and "developing black pride" (15% and 56%, respectively) than were those who cited the NAACP (02% and 36%). Conversely, those who cited the NAACP more frequently selected "helping to find jobs" (51%) than did those who cited the Panthers (25%).[2]

---

[2] Chi squares with one degree of freedom and corresponding probability levels for these three sets of comparisons were as follows: 5.05, $p < .025$; 4.76, $p < .05$; 8.78, $p < .005$.

IV. Differences Between Northern Cities

Since our sample of four cities outside the south included two very large cities in the upper midwest and east, respectively, and two medium-sized border cities, it is possible for us to explore the issue of whether differences exist in the attitudes of black high school students in these two contrasting types of city. In the remainder of this section the former two cities will be referred to as northern cities and the latter two as border cities. While a sample of only two schools in each of these categories is too small to allow for definitive conclusions, a pattern of consistent differences between the two (large) northern cities on the one hand and the two (medium-sized) border cities on the other would suggest that conditions associated with size and region may play a part in shaping the attitudes of black youth.

To explore these possibilities, comparisons were made between the combined responses of students in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City and the combined responses of students in Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City. The procedure followed was to study response patterns to identify those on which large differences seemed to exist between Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City respondents on the one hand and Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City on the other. Particular attention was given to items on which the authors had some reason to believe that there might be differences in the attitudes of black students in large northern cities as compared with black high school students in medium-sized border cities. Comparisons between the two groups on some of the items dealing with respondents' assessment of local facilities and services in their home cities are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Comparisons Between Ratings of Local Services and Facilities of Respondents in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City and Respondents in Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City

Service and Response Categories Selected for Comparison	Proportion in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City		Proportion in Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City		Chi Square and Level of Significance
		%		%	
Housing very poor or poor	105/239	44	153/249	61	13.92; $<.001$
Employment very poor or poor	62/238	26	114/251	45	19.04; $<.001$
Education very poor or poor	61/236	26	98/247	40	9.82; $<.005$
Health very poor or poor	50/234	21	91/247	37	13.14; $<.001$
Transportation very poor or poor	44/234	19	92/253	36	16.81; $<.001$
Police very poor or poor	129/232	56	162/246	66	4.83; $<.05$
Recreation very poor or poor	107/231	46	136/244	56	3.82; $<.05$
Welfare very poor or poor	98/237	41	114/236	48	2.02; $>.05$

The data in Table 3 show that on seven of the eight comparisons, the proportions of Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City respondents who say that services and facilities for black people in their city are "poor" or "very poor" is greater at a statistically significant level of .05 or better than are the comparable proportions for respondents from Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City; on the eighth comparison (welfare), responses of the two groups are not significantly different.[1] Thus it is clear that respondents in the two large northern cities are less positive about the quality of important public and social services available to black people in their neighborhoods than are respondents in the two smaller border cities.[2]

In addition, it was also found that the percentage of respondents in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City who said their neighbors feel safe "Almost all the time" or "Most of the time" was significantly larger at the .001 level than the comparable percentage of respondents in Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City ($X^2 = 15.16$; df - 1).

Similar findings emerged with respect to items on the questionnaire that dealt in one way or another with perceptions of opportunity for oneself or for black people in general. For example, in response to the question, "Do you feel your opportunities for the future are good?", only 67 percent of the respondents in the two large northern cities as compared with 79 percent in the two smaller border cities chose the categories "very good" or "good" ($X^2 = 8.12$; df = 1; $p < .005$).[3] In responding to the item, "What do you think is the most important reason why some black citizens have engaged in violence?", Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City respondents more frequently attributed such violence to the response category "lack of opportunity" in preference to the categories attributing it to "looting," "revenge," or "stupidity" than did respondents in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City ($X^2 = 11.42$; df = 1; p .001). When the category "out of stupidity" was removed from consideration, respondents in the two smaller cities more frequently attributed "violence engaged in by some black citizens" to motives of "revenge" or "looting" than did respondents in the two larger cities ($X^2 = 13.18$. df = 1; $p < .001$).

---

[1] In nearly all cases these differences held for both males and females when separate comparisons were made with the subsamples divided by sex.

[2] The conclusion that students in the two larger northern cities tend to be more negative about local services than respondents in the two medium-sized border cities is supported further by responses to the item, "How would you describe your attitudes toward the police?" In response, 75% of the former group, as compared with only 48% of the latter, described themselves as "Very unfavorable" or "Unfavorable" ($X^2 = 24.03$; df = 1; $p < .005$). In explaining their answers, furthermore, 25% of the Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City volunteered answers which categorized the police as "bullies," "prejudiced," or "pigs," as compared with only 48% of the latter, described themselves as "Very unfavorable" or "Unfavorable" ($X^2 = 24.03$; df = 1; $p < .005$). In explaining their answers, furthermore, 25% of the Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City volunteered answers which categorized the police as "bullies," "prejudiced," or "pigs," as compared with 15% in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City ($X^2 = 7.60$; df = 1; $p < .01$).

We have not chosen to emphasize this difference in attitudes toward the police, however, primarily because both Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City are nationally known for the bitterness of the relations between the police and many groups in the black community. In both cities, government officials have openly supported repressive measures against blacks, police have been murdered without provocation while on duty in the ghetto, and blacks have been killed in very questionable circumstances as regards the proper and measured use of police power. Both cities also are nationally known for the strength and internecine warfare of their teenage and young-adult gangs. For these reasons, differences in attitude toward the police between our two northern cities on the one hand and our two border cities on the other, may not reflect regional or size differences but rather may be due to the special circumstances which exist in our two northern cities.

Another set of variables on which students in the two large northern cities differed from students in the two smaller border cities involved three items which were concerned with separatism. In response to the question, "Do you think our nation will be separated into two nations, one black and one white?:, 31% of the former group said such a development was "Almost certain," "Certain," or "Probable, as compared with only 18% of the latter group ($X^2 = 11.51$; df = 1; $p < .001$).[4] In responding to the item, "Do you feel this would be desirable or undesirable," furthermore, 29% of the respondents in the two larger cities who were willing to take a definite stand replied that separation was "Very desirable" or "Desirable," as contrasted with a corresponding figure of 11% among respondents in the two smaller cities ($X^2 - 16.14$; df = 1; $p < .001$). In responding to the question, "If the situation arose, would you be willing to live in an integrated neighborhood?", finally, respondents in Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City less frequently said "Definitely" or "Probably" than did respondents in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City ($X^2 = 7.97$; df = 1; $p < .005$).[5] Thus respondents in the two larger northern cities not only were relatively more inclined to believe that separation "into two nations" would occur, but also were more favorable toward such a development and less willing to consider living in integrated communities.[6]

---

[3] Because males in our overall sample were significantly more optimistic than the females at the .05 level, and because our Kansas City sample had a much higher proportion of males than our Eastern City sample, we would not have accepted this difference as significant if it had not exceeded the .01 level. As a double check, comparisons also were made with the samples subdivided first by sex and then by grade level. The difference between the two northern cities and the two border cities persisted for each sex and for 12th graders, but not for 11th graders.

[4] For the same reasons as those described in footnote 3, we would not have accepted this difference as significant if it had not reached the .01 level. The difference was found to hold for both sexes, even though sex correlated with responses on this item at the .01 level in the overall sample.

[5] For reasons similar to those cited in footnotes 2 and 3, we would not have accepted this difference as significant unless it had reached the .01 level.

[6] There was no apparent difference between the two groups, however, with respect to the item "How desirable do you think it is to achieve integrated housing?"; approximately 40% of the respondents in both groups felt that the achievement of integrated housing is "not particularly desirable."

Still another type of item on which respondents in the two large northern cities differed from respondents in the two border cities were those designed to tap respondents' sense of fate control. As we noted in the section on "General Portrayal of Respondents in Northern Cities," such items have been shown to be sensitive and powerful predictors of achievement in school. In the present study, the percentages of respondents in the two types of cities who agreed with the two statements used to tap sense of fate control indicated that black youth in the two large northern cities tended to feel less sense of control over their futures than did their counterparts in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City. As shown in Table 4, Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City respondents were less inclined to give fatalistic responses than were respondents in Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City.[7]

TABLE 4A

Percentages of Respondents in Large Northern Cities and Smaller Border Cities Who "Agree Much" or "Agree Very Much" with Two Fate Control Items*

	Cities					
Item	Kansas City	Lower MW City	Kansas City and Lower MW City	Eastern City	Upper MW City	Eastern City and Upper MW City
Good luck is more important than hard work for success.	08	09	08	11	19	16
People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life.	04	04	04	08	18	13
Combined percentage on both items	-	-	07	-	-	15

*Percentages in this table are based on the numbers of respondents who either agreed or disagreed with the statements and do not include respondents who marked "Not sure."

In sum, our data suggest that black youth in large northern cities tend to be more negative about the quality of local services and facilities for black people and the safety of their neighborhoods than are black youth in smaller border cities such as Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City, less positive about their opportunities for the future, more fatalistic about their chances in life, more inclined to attribute violence engaged in by "some black citizens" to lack of opportunity, and more supportive of separatism as well as more expectant that the United States may be "separated into two nations, one black and one white."

---

[7] The differences (in terms of respondents agreeing relative to those disagreeing) between Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City respondents on the one hand and Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City respondents on the other hand were significant at the .001 level on the "People like me . . ." item and on the two items combined and at the .10 level on the "Good luck . . ." item.

Upper Midwestern City contrasted with Eastern City

The preceding section identified several ways in which the attitudes of black youth may be related to size and/or regional location among cities in the north. Since Upper Midwestern City is a good deal larger than Eastern City, the two groups of students would be expected to differ on these same attitudes (i.e., those described in the preceding section) in a direction consonant with the differences in size of city. More specifically, Upper Midwestern City respondents should be more negative than Eastern City respondents about local services and facilities, less positive and more fatalistic about their opportunities for the future, more fatalistic, more inclined to attribute violence engaged in by "some black citizens" to lack of opportunity, and more supportive of separatism as well as more expectant that separatism will occur.

To test these hypotheses, comparisons similar to those reported in the preceding section were made between the responses of students in Upper Midwestern City and students in Eastern City. Before describing these comparisons, it should be emphasized that previous visual inspection had indicated that Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City ranked first and second (or third and fourth, depending on the perspective) among the four non-southern cities on all the items dealt with in this part of the report.

As regards the quality of local services and facilities, the hypothesis was confirmed in that on four of the eight comparisons respondents in Upper Midwestern City more frequently said local services or facilities were "Poor" or "Very Poor" than did respondents in Eastern City (welfare, $p < .005$; employment, $p < .05$; education, $p < .05$; police, $p < .005$); in none of the remaining four cases were respondents in Eastern City significantly more negative about the quality of local services than respondents in Upper Midwestern City.[8]

As regards safety in their neighborhoods, there was no significant difference in the percentages of respondents who said their neighbors feel safe "Almost all" or "Most" of the time ($X^2 = .49$; df = 1; $p < .10$).

As regards opportunities for the future, a smaller percentage of respondents in Upper Midwestern City felt their opportunities for the future were "Very good" or "Good" than was true among respondents in Eastern City ($X^2 = 7.22$; df = 1; $p < .01$).

As regards fatalism, Upper Midwestern City respondents were more likely to see themselves as exercising less control over their lives than were respondents in

---

[8] Respondents in Upper Midwestern City were not personally less favorable toward the police than were respondents in Eastern City. Rather, it could be said that both groups were equally - and overwhelmingly - unfavorable: 76% of the students in Eastern City and 75% in Upper Midwestern City said their attitudes toward the police were either "Unfavorable" or "Very unfavorable."

Eastern City.[9]

As regards attribution of "violence engaged in by some black people" to "lack of opportunity," the prediction not only was not borne out, but it was found that the percentage in Eastern City attributing violence to this cause was slightly higher than the comparable percentage in Upper Midwestern City. This difference between the two cities, however, was not significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = .70$; df = 1; $p > .05$).

As regards expectancy that "our country will be separated into two nations, one black and one white," the prediction was confirmed: a smaller percentage of Upper Midwestern City respondents than of Eastern City respondents said such separation would "Probably not" occur or would be "Very unlikely" ($X^2 = 5.89$; df = 1; $p < .025$).[10] As regards support for separatism, however, there was no significant difference between respondents in the two cities ($X^2 = 1.35$; df = 1; $p > .05$).[11]

On balance, our hypotheses that Upper Midwestern City students would differ from Eastern City respondents on the variables described above were confirmed at least partially on four of the six groups of comparisons.[12] Since these results are compatible with the previous finding concerning differences between the two northern cities and the two border cities, they lend additional support to the conclusion that black youth in segregated environments in larger non-southern cities tend to be more negative about local conditions, less optimistic and more fatalistic about their future, and more expectant that separation will occur than are their counterparts in smaller non-southern cities.

Having identified several differences possibly associated with size of city, we can speculate that the underlying factor responsible for some of these differences may well be size of the ghetto. That is, it stands to reason that the low-income black ghettoes in Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City probably are considerably larger in size than their counterparts in Kansas City and Lower Midwest City. However, we do not have any data showing that the respondents in our Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City samples actually do live in larger ghettoes than do our Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City respondents; hence we cannot directly test the hypothesis that size of ghetto may be a more important determinant of the attitudinal differences reported in this section than size of city. But since attitudes regarding optimism and fatalism about the future, separatism, and rating of local services obviously are important to the future of urban development in general and the future of race relations, and since black ghettoes in many U. S. cities are constantly growing larger, this hypothesis should be explicitly investigated in further research.

---

[9] The differences between Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City respondents were significant at the .05 level on the "People like me . . ." item at the .01 level on the two items combined.

[10] A striking 42% of the respondents in Upper Midwestern City said that separation either was "Almost certain," "Certain," or "Probable." This finding suggests that expectancy of separatism already may be far advanced among black youth who have little contact with whites in very large northern cities.

[11] Although not significant, the difference of seven percentage points was in the predicted direction.

[12] These differences with respect to opportunities for the future and the likelihood of separation run counter to what one would expect given the differing sexual composition of the Eastern and Upper Midwestern City samples, thus lending additional support to the conclusion that they are meaningfully associated with size of city.

Kansas City contrasted with Lower Midwestern City

Following the same reasoning as led us to hypothesize differences would exist between Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City on the variables which discriminated between Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City on the one hand and Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City on the other, we also examined the differences between Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City on these variables. Since Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City differ only by 15 or 20% in size,[13] we hypothesized that responses of students in our samples from these two cities would not differ at a statistically significant level on these variables. However, there is reason to believe that the black ghetto in Lower Midwestern City is much larger than in Kansas City; thus if responses are associated more with size of ghetto per se than with size of city, we might expect to find differences between Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City similar to those we found in the two preceding sections.

In almost every case the hypotheses of no difference between Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City on these variables were borne out. With regard to the eight local neighborhood services, Kansas City respondents were significantly more positive at or beyond the .05 level only on health ($X^2 = 17.01$; df = 1; $p < .001$), and on five of the eight comparisons there was almost no difference between the two cities.

With regard to perceptions of neighbors' safety, there was no difference in the percentages of respondents who said their neighbors feel safe "Almost all" or "Most" of the time ($X^2 = .02$; df = 1; $p > .10$).

With regard to opportunities for the future, the proportions of respondents in the two cities who saw their opportunities as "Very good" or "Good" were not significantly different from each other ($X^2 = .310$; df = 1; $p > .50$).

With regard to sense of fate control, however, Kansas City respondents were less likely to give a fatalistic response than were students in Lower Midwestern City.[14]

---

[13] By way of contrast, Upper Midwestern City is twice as large as Eastern City, and Eastern City is four times as large as Kansas City.

[14] The differences between Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City respondents were significant at the .005 level on the "People like me . . ." item and at the .001 level on both items combined.

With regard to both the likelihood and desirability of separation, the proportions of respondents who said, respectively, that separation was "almost certain," "certain," or "probable," or said it was "Very desirable" or "Desirable" were not significantly different from one another ($X^2 = .44$; df = 1; $p > .50$; $X^2 = 98$; df = 1; $p > .25$).

With regard to attribution of violence to "lack of opportunity," the proportions of respondents in the two cities who attributed violence to this cause were nearly identical ($X^2 = 1.63$; df = 1; $p > .10$).

Summary

Summarizing the data reported in this section, it was found that:

1. Respondents in Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City were more negative about seven of eight local services and about safety in their neighborhoods, less optimistic about their opportunities for the future, more fatalistic, more inclined to attribute "violence engaged in by some black citizens" to lack of opportunity, and more expectant of and supportive of separation than were respondents in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City.

2. Respondents in Upper Midwestern City were more negative about four of eight local services, less optimistic about their opportunities for the future, more fatalistic, and more expectant that the United States will be separated into two nations, "one black and one white," than were respondents in Eastern City.

3. None of these differences were found between respondents in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City, except that Kansas City students rated local health services more favorably and were less fatalistic than Lower Midwestern City students.

The patterns described above are generally supportive of the hypothesis that the attitudes of black youth with regard to: 1) adequacy of local neighborhoods; 2) personal opportunities for the future; 3) the probability that the races will be separated into "two nations"; and, to a lesser extent, 4) the desirability of separatism and 5) the attribution of "violence among some black people" to "lack of opportunity" are associated with size of city. The findings with respect to fatalism are supportive of the hypothesis that sense of powerlessness is associated more directly with size of the ghetto. However, it also must be kept in mind that other things being equal, size of ghetto will tend to be associated with size of city. The ghetto in Upper Midwestern City can be presumed to be much larger than the ghetto in Eastern City, and both are much larger than the ghetto in Lower Midwestern City, thus making it difficult to conclude that size of city rather than size of the ghetto is the more important variable associated with the response patterns reported in this section. On the other hand, the general lack of differences found between Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City on attitudes discussed in this section, despite the likelihood that the ghetto in the former city is much smaller than that in the latter, does suggest that size of city is a more important variable with respect to most of these attitudes.

It is also possible that differences discussed in this section are associated primarily with region of the country rather than size of city or size of the ghetto, though the differences found between Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City indicate that size is a more important variable. If subsequent research were to bear out the relationship between size of city and/or size of the ghetto and the attitudes described above, an observer might expect that barring significant changes in societal dynamics, black youth in northern and western cities will become more negative about their neighborhoods and opportunities and more expectant and supportive of separation as black ghettoes in many of these cities grow increasingly larger in the next decade and their inhabitants become still more isolated within metropolitan areas and/or cities which are growing in population.

V. Differences Between Deep South City and Other Cities

Since students in Deep South City live in a part of the country with a history distinctive from that of the four northern and northern-oriented border cities in our sample, it is reasonable to expect that their views on the social issues included in this survey will differ in important respects from those of respondents in the remainder of the sample. As already reported, Deep South City respondents were even more distrustful of whites and had more negative feelings about whites than were respondents in the other cities. Other attitudes on which differences emerged are reported in this section.

The approach taken in investigating possible differences was to inspect the data visually in order to identify items on which response patterns in Deep South City appeared to be consistently different from those in three or four of the remaining schools in the sample. Chi-square tests then were used to determine whether these apparent differences were reliable.

In several instances, Deep South City students differed from students in the other cities on items which presumably tapped respondents' attitudes toward and/or knowledge of conditions in residentially segregated medium-sized and large cities, particularly those in the north and west. For example, in responding to the item, "Do you think schools in the north will be integrated?", a large majority of Deep South City respondents (159 of 199) said they felt this was "very likely" or "likely." By way of contrast, respondents in the other cities - all of whom attend segregated schools located in segregated neighborhoods in larger cities further north - gave a more realistic response: a smaller majority (272 of 507) said that schools in the north were likely to be integrated ($X^2 = 40.30$; df = 1; $p < .001$).

Another item which presumably tapped respondents' familiarity with black ghettoes in medium- and large-sized cities was the open-ended question, "What does the term 'ghetto' mean to you?" In response, 26% of 204 respondents in Deep South City wrote in answers such as "concentration camp," "prison," "restricted area," or "reservation," as compared with a maximum of 7% and an average of 2% in the other four cities ($X^2 = 113.45$; df = 1; $p < .001$). Conversely, a much smaller percentage of Deep South City students (29 of 184) responded "yes" to the question, "Do you feel you live in a ghetto?" than was true in the other four cities individually or as a whole (233 of 490). Thus the conclusion follows that black students who do not live in big city ghettoes are more likely to view such neighborhoods as "concentration camps" than do black students who live there.

Perhaps respondents in Deep South City may be more prone to define a ghetto as a "concentration camp" because they depend more on the mass media for their images of the term than do youth who grow up there.[1] Another possible reason is that black youth in small southern cities may be more prone to view their own communities negatively than do black youth in northern cities and may extrapolate this perception to black communities elsewhere.

---

[1] By way of contrast, respondents in the four larger cities, most of whom presumably lived in sizable segregated neighborhoods, were more likely to define "ghetto" simply as an "overcrowded slum," "a black neighborhood," or "a part of the city where a minority group lives" than were respondents in Deep South City. The respective percentages of respondents who gave one of these three answers in each city were as follows: Kansas City: 90%; Eastern City: 93%; Upper Midwestern City: 76%; Lower Midwestern City: 91%; Deep South City: 61%. Chi-square tests showed that these differences between Deep South City and each of the other cities were significant at the .025 level or beyond.

Other data available to us, however, tend to contradict the second explanation. One of the items on the questionnaire asked respondents to rate the adequacy of "the services or facilities for black people in your city" by checking whether services involving housing, employment, education, health, transportation, police, recreation, and welfare are "very good," "good," "mediocre," "poor," or "very poor." Ratings for each service given by respondents in Deep South City as compared with respondents in the other four cities are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4B

Comparisons Between Ratings of Local Services and Facilities of Respondents in Deep South City and Respondents in Kansas City, Eastern City, Upper Midwestern City, and Lower Midwestern City

Service & Response Categories Selected for Comparison	Proportion in Deep South City	Proportion in Other Four Cities	Chi Square & Level of Significance
Housing very good or good	44/201	60/487	9.42; $p < .005$
Employment very good or good	55/198	110/488	2.96; $p > .05$
Education very good or good	92/202	141/483	16.24; $p < .001$
Health very good or good	101/195	181/480	10.73; $p < .005$
Transportation very good or good	87/194	195/472	.56; $p > .05$
Police very good or good	61/197	71/478	22.00; $p < .001$
Recreation very poor or poor	138/195	243/475	20.86; $p < .001$
Welfare very good or good	63/197	92/466	15.71; $p < .001$

As shown in Table 4, Deep South City respondents are more positive about local facilities than respondents in the four larger northern cities on five of our eight comparisons, are not significantly different on two comparisons, and are more negative on only one comparison (recreation). In addition, Deep South City youth were much more likely to describe themselves as "favorable" or "very favorable" toward the police than were respondents in the other four cities.[2] Therefore we conclude that Deep South City students' images of black ghettoes /in larger cities/ are being molded primarily by the mass media and are not primarily extrapolations of negative perceptions of their own community.

---

[2] One hundred of 145 Deep South City respondents who responded to this item described themselves as favorable or very favorable, as compared with only 126 of 338 respondents in the other cities.

Further support for this interpretation also was provided by responses to the item, "Do you think it is possible that you might ever find yourself participating in a riot?" In response, slightly more than two-thirds of students in Deep South City as compared with 43% of respondents in the other four cities said this was "very possible" or it "could happen."[3] Since it is probable that the image of what a riot is like of students in Deep South City is influenced by their perceptions of highly publicized riots which have occurred in large northern cities, and since their responses on this item were so different from the responses of students in larger cities, it is not unwarranted to conclude that the affirmative response of Deep South City students was due in part to faulty knowledge of what a riot in a big city is really like.

Similarly, respondents in Deep South City were far more likely than respondents in other cities ($X^2 = 45.13$; df = 1; $p < .001$) to cite the Black Muslims as a group which was "doing the most to help black people." This difference may also be partly due, however, to other causes as well as lack of knowledge of what is really happening in the big cities: the Muslims may be unusually active in Deep South City, or there may be relatively few prominent black groups active there.

Still another item on which students in Deep South City differed from respondents in other cities was, "What does 'Black Power' mean to you?" In responding to this open-ended item, 29% of the students in Deep South City but no more than 19% of the respondents in any other city gave an answer which was classified in the category "Total equality and freedom to do what whites do."[4] Almost certainly, this difference reflects a continuing struggle to achieve elemental civil rights for black people in the south as compared with a shift toward achieving improved living conditions in northern cities where formal rights such as voting presumably have been attained. In this sense, outright racial discrimination probably is a more salient problem in the south than in the north, where racism tends to take a more institutionalized and less overt form. This difference, too, is reflected in the data in this study: 35% of the respondents in Deep South City, as compared with only 17% in the remainder of the sample, specified "racial discrimination" as the "biggest problem holding black people back in your city" ($X^2 = 21.72$; df = 1; $p < .001$). Similarly, 41% of those respondents in Deep South City who said there were "Very serious" or "Moderately serious" problems getting a job in their home town explained that the problem was caused by racial discrimination and/or the unavailability of anything but menial opportunities for blacks, as compared with 23% in the other four cities ($X^2 = 20.69$; df = 1; $p < .005$). Conversely, only 7% of the Deep South City respondents as compared to 17% in the remainder of the sample specified "lack of unity" (a phenomenon more characteristic of larger communities facing more subtle problems) as the "biggest problem" they thought was holding back black people in their city ($X^2 = 10.02$; df = 1; $p < .005$).

Perhaps because they were more inclined than students in other cities to attribute the problems of black people directly to overt racial discrimination, respondents in Deep South City more frequently selected the category "to gain equal rights" in explaining why "some black citizens have engaged in violence" than did respondents elsewhere ($X^2 = 49.60$; df = 1; p .001). (However, this difference also may reflect in part a less sophisticated knowledge of the mixed motives underlying highly-publicized riots that occurred in northern cities). Similarly, students in Deep South City selected the category "Whites accepting blacks as equals" more frequently in responding to the question on what is needed "to achieve the goals of black people" than did respondents in the other four cities ($X^2 = 8.19$; df = 1; p .005). In addition, the probability that problems stemming from overt racial discrimination in the south are more easy to initially alleviate (given the desire and resources) than are the more complex problems associated with institutionalized racism in the urban north also may help account for the fact that a higher percentage of respondents in Deep South City (12%) than in the other four cities (5%) said they had become more optimistic in the last few years because of "recent changes in the country" or because "things are gradually getting better" ($X^2 = 9.36$; df = 1; $p < .005$).

---

[3] $X^2 = 16.72$; $p < .001$. Both male and female respondents in Deep South City were more likely to envision themselves as possibly participating in a riot than were males and females in the other cities.

[4] The difference between the Deep South City sample and the other four cities was significant at the .01 level ($X^2 = 7.47$; df = 1).

VI. Differences Between Upper Midwestern City and Other Cities

As in the case of Deep South City, there were several consistent differences between respondents in Upper Midwestern City and respondents in the other cities. We have already noted that on the average respondents in Upper Midwestern City reported knowing fewer whites well than did respondents elsewhere, thus indicating that this city's reputation as the most segregated big city in the United States may be deserved. We also have noted several ways in which the responses of Upper Midwestern City students differed from those of students in the other three non-southern cities in a manner associated with the fact that Upper Midwest City is a larger city that has a larger black population and a larger ghetto. Response patterns on which students in Upper Midwestern City were distinguishable from students in the other four cities are summarized in this section.

In accordance with differences reported in Chapter IV with respect to views on separatism among respondents in the northern cities, respondents in Upper Midwestern City were more favorable toward separatism than were respondents in the remaining sample: 21% of the respondents in Upper Midwestern City as compared with 13% in the remainder of the sample and no more than 16% in any other city said that separatism either was "very desirable" or "desirable."[1] In addition, Upper Midwestern City respondents also were much more inclined to believe that it was "Certain," "Almost certain," or "Probable" that "our country will be separated into two nations, one black and one white" than were respondents in the other four cities ($X^2 = 15.20$; df = 1; $p < .001$).

With regard to local services and facilities, respondents in Upper Midwestern City were significantly more inclined to rate education ($X^2 = 20.20$; df = 1; $p < .05$), welfare ($X^2 = 4.70$; df = 1; $p < .05$), and health services ($X^2 = 10.73$; df = 1; $p < .005$) in the "poor" or "very poor" categories than were respondents in the other four cities. The difference in ratings of education services for black people was particularly striking: Upper Midwestern City was the only city in which more than half of the respondents who answered this item rated local education as "Poor" or "very poor." As has been argued in previous sections, these differences in ratings of local services and perceptions of opportunities for the future possibly are a result of the fact that Upper Midwest City is larger than the other cities sampled in this study.

With regard to opportunities for the future, a lower percentage (59%) of the respondents in Upper Midwestern City felt the opportunities open to them were "Very good" or "Good" than was true (75%) in the other cities ($X^2 = 11.27$; df = 1; $p < .001$).

Summary

To summarize the situation in Upper Midwestern City as compared with the other cities in our sample, respondents in Upper Midwestern City knew fewer whites well, were more pessimistic about their opportunities for the future, were more supportive of separatism and more expectant that it would occur, and were more negative about services in their neighborhoods than were respondents in the other cities.[2] Upper Midwestern City is a very large city which is widely regarded as the most segregated northern city in the United States - a reputation which is supported by government census data. (Our finding that on the average respondents in Upper Midwestern City know fewer whites well than do students in our other subsamples also is quite compatible with this reputation.) Taken together our data suggest that black youth in Upper Midwestern City are more isolated from the mainstream of majority white society than are respondents in the remainder of our sample. It is not difficult to hypothesize that their views on separatism and their perceptions of their own opportunities for the future and the quality of services in their neighborhoods may be partly a function of their isolation, as well as the status of police-community relations, the objective quality fo services in their neighborhoods, and other interrelated forces. When it also is taken into account that black ghettoes in many cities apparently are becoming larger and more highly segregated with each passing year, it would not be unwarranted to prophecy that black youth in such cities may well become more separatist in philosophy and negative concerning their opportunities and living conditions if segregation is allowed to advance much further in the future.

---

[1] This difference between Upper Midwestern City and the remaining four cities was significant at the .025 level ($X^2 = 6.19$; df = 1).

---

[2] These differences regarding perceptions of opportunities for the future and expectations regarding separatism run counter to what might have been expected given the sexual composition of the Upper Midwestern sample compared to the other samples, thus reinforcing our conclusion that they probably are associated with size of city.

VII. Differences Between Kansas City and Other Cities

In the previous sections, we already have reported several ways in which the responses of students in our Kansas City sample were different from those of students in other cities.[1] These differences were as follows:

1. Kansas City respondents on the average knew more whites well and indicated lower levels of dislike and distrust of whites than did respondents in the other cities.

2. Kansas City respondents were less likely to cite the Black Panthers (or local affiliates) as an organization "doing the most to help black people" and more likely to cite government employment agencies than were respondents in the other cities.

It also should be kept in mind that respondents in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City were more optimistic about their future, more positive about local neighborhood services, less expectant of and supportive of separatism, and less inclined to perceive civil disturbance as due to "lack of opportunity" than were respondents in Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City - the two larger cities further to the north.

Examination of responses to additional items showed that other ways in which response patterns in Kansas City differed from those in other cities were as follows:

1. Students in Kansas City less frequently "Disagreed" or "Disagreed very much" with "the ideas of black people who argue" in favor of non-violence than did students in the other cities ($X^2 = 4.04$; df = 1; $p < .05$).

2. Students in Kansas City were more inclined to think that white-black problems "Very definitely," "Definitely," or "Probably" will be "solved in a peaceful and constructive way than were respondents in the other cities" ($X^2 = 12.75$; df - 1; $p < .001$).

These two findings were not unexpected inasmuch as we already have seen that attitudes concerning non-violence and expectancies regarding the resolution of black-white problems both are related to the trust - liking - contacts-with-whites syndrome, and that Kansas City respondents were more favorable toward whites and knew more whites well than did respondents in the other cities.

3. Kansas City respondents were less inclined to think that the problems of getting a job in their city were "Very serious" than were respondents elsewhere ($X^2 = 16.80$; df = 1; $p < .001$).

---

[1] As defined here, this means that responses in Kansas City were different (i.e., at one end of a continuum) from those in each of the other cities, even though in some cases a difference betwen Kansas City and the next-ranked city on a particular variable may not have been statistically significant at the .05 level.

4. Kansas City respondents tended to cite organizations which they said were helping black people by "helping set up black business" more frequently than did respondents in the other cities ($X^2 = 3.31$; df = 1; $p < .10$). Although this difference was not statistically significant at the .05 level, the trend agrees with those on other items on which Kansas City respondents seemed to be more positive about local economic conditions.

5. Kansas City respondents more frequently defined the term "Black Power" as "just another word" ($X^2 = 12.51$; df = 1; $p < .001$) and less frequently defined it in terms of "black unity and pride" ($X^2 = 6.33$; df = 1; $p < .025$) than did respondents in the other four cities.

Considered together, these findings suggest that black youth in Kansas City may be more positive about local social and economic conditions, particularly as regards relations with whites and economic opportunities for black people, than are respondents in the other four cities in our sample. They seem to be less alienated in the sense that relatively fewer respondents in Kansas City than in the other cities have turned to separatist philosophies or Black Power rhetoric or have rejected non-violence as a means to social change. To this extent, many Kansas Citians of both races may view the results of this study as being relatively encouraging as regards the situation in that city, particularly in comparison with Upper Midwestern City and Eastern City.

Several comments, however, also are in order as part of this discussion.

First, we did find evidence that on at least some of the key attitudes examined in this study, the views of black youth in Kansas City appear to be moving in the direction of attitudes found among respondents in the other cities.

Second, we found a good deal of evidence (see Chapter XI) suggesting that trust in whites and contact with whites as measured by number of whites known well play an important part in affecting certain obviously important attitudes such as views on separation and views on the future of race relations. In this regard, it must be kept in mind that better than 40% of our Kansas City respondents say they do not know more than one white person well and nearly half say they trust 10% or less of whites; the latter figure represents a sizable increase since 1968.

Third, and related to point two, we found evidence that many of these variables may be associated with size of city and, inferentially, with size of the black ghetto. On this basis it might be predicted that other things being equal, black youth in Kansas City may well become more alienated from the larger metropolitan society as the racially-segregated community in which so many of them live continues to grow larger during the next decade.

It will be interesting to see whether the trends and patterns evident in our Kansas City data persist in the future. In general the major thrust for alleviation of the plight of the inner city poor - particularly the minority poor - in Kansas City has been through traditional approaches to social change and social mobility. Major emphasis, for example, has been placed on job training for the more highly motivated poor and on increasing economic opportunity for the black middle class, with little or no meaningful effort on a city-wide or metropolitan-wide basis to reduce the social or racial isolation of the poor or other major minority groups. Similarly, major emphasis in institutional development has been on increasing the resources available to inner city institutions, with little or no real citizen participation in decision-making processes in institutions such as the schools. Positions of responsibility and status in anti-poverty programs, Model Cities programs, teacher aide programs, etc., generally have gone to low-income citizens who already were active or visible in their neighborhoods, in the hope that more alienated and socially-handicapped children and adults at the bottom of the status pyramid would be encouraged to emulate the success of their more middle-class oriented neighbors.

Traditional community development approaches of this type are characterized by incremental institutional change as well as by poverty-patronage politics and a trickle-down philosophy in motivating the poor and/or the alienated. That this approach already is a demonstrated failure in many larger cities does not necessarily mean that it inevitably will fail in Kansas City. Some may see in our data evidence that this approach is working passably well in Kansas City and may point to other data showing considerable economic progress among the poor and the minorities, even in the face of two major construction strikes and a national recession. Some may point to other aspects of our findings which indicate some cause for pessimism concerning the future, and may point out that crime and delinquency and other indices of social disorganization - particularly among youth and young adults - have been increasing markedly in recent years[2] despite the economic and social gains registered by some segments of the socially and racially isolated inner city population. Only the future, of course, will reveal which interpretation is more accurate and prophetic of the shape of things to come. Observers in some other cities may wish to pay close attention to developments in Kansas City to determine whether traditional approaches to social change still have some utility, at least in medium-sized cities of the west and north.

---

[2] Official data indicate that crime rates decreased in Kansas City in 1970 and 1971, but it would be foolish to conclude on the basis of these short-term data that a long-range rise in crime and delinquency rates in the inner city has been permanently stemmed or reversed.

VIII. Differences Between Kansas City Samples in 1968 and 1970

One of our principal objectives in undertaking this study was to determine whether Kansas City respondents in 1970 would differ in their attitudes from respondents in our previous study in 1968 and thus to obtain an indication of whether the attitudes of black youth in the city might have undergone measurable changes between 1968 and 1970. To explore this issue, response patterns among the two samples on items which were identical or similar on both questionnaires were carefully studied and statistical tests were made on items for which visual inspection indicated that the two samples might indeed differ. (Table 1 shows the distribution of responses for the two samples on all these items.) Differences which were examined and tested for statistical significance are reported in this section.

Background variables

Before responses of the 1970 sample could be compared with responses of the 1968 sample, however, account had to be taken of differences in grade level, social class background, and sex between the two samples. As shown in Table 5, the 1970 sample had smaller proportions of upper-level students and of females and a higher proportion of Social Class 1-3 (middle class) students than did the 1968 sample. To the extent that responses to items on the questionnaire are associated with these three background variables, differences in response between the two samples might be reflecting differences in their composition on these variables rather than possible changes in attitudes over the two-year period between the two samples.

TABLE 5

Composition of the 1968 and 1970 Kansas City Samples, by Grade Level, Sex, and Social Class

Grade Level	1968		1970	
	%	(N)	%	(N)
9	22	(114)	-	-
10	32	(167)	37	(69)
11	24	(127)	36	(67)
12	23	(121)	28	(52)
Sex				
Male	40	(211)	47	(89)
Female	60	(318)	53	(99)
Social Class[1]				
1-3	14	(72)	19	(31)
4	40	(213)	43	(69)
5	46	(244)	38	(60)

In an earlier section we mentioned that very few correlations as high or higher than .20 were found between background variables and responses to numerically-scored attitudinal items either within or across schools. For the 1970 Kansas City sample, only two correlations were .20 or higher, and none was higher than .21. The two correlations were between grade level and responses on the trust in whites item (.20), and between sex and responses on the item dealing with opportunities for the future (.21). Since in most cases the background variables were not correlated with responses on the attitude items, and since the two correlations cited above account for only four percent of the variance in the dependent (attitude) variables, we conclude that grade level, sex, and social class (as measured in this study) are only slightly and inconsistently associated with attitudes held by respondents in the 1970 Kansas City sample. Stated differently, lower-grade students, males, and low-status students responded to items in much the same way as did upper-grade students, females, and high-status students, respectively. Since visual inspection of the data on the 1968 sample also had revealed only a few, slight relationships between background variables and respondents' attitudes, we may continue to make comparisons between the two samples without worrying much about differences in their composition by sex, social class, and grade level. Nevertheless, the two correlations cited above will be taken into account in the following discussion in that differences between the 1968 and 1970 Kansas City samples on these items will not be treated as reliable unless they reach the .01 level.

---

[1] Data to compute social class were not available for 28 respondents in the 1970 sample.

It also should be noted that the 1968 sample consisted of students from two additional high schools besides the one (Lincoln High School) from which the 1970 sample was drawn. Analysis of the 1968 data had indicated that response patterns varied little from school to school, hence allowing us to combine respondents from the three schools to constitute the 1968 sample. However, although there had been almost no variation between schools on most items in 1968, there were a small number of items on which responses at Lincoln did differ from responses at the other two schools; on these items we will use 1968 responses only from Lincoln High School in making 1968-70 comparisons.

Comparisons between 1968 and 1970 samples

One striking difference between the 1968 and 1970 samples was that respondents in 1970 were more polarized in low- and high-contact-with-whites groups than were respondents in 1968. On the one hand, 32% of the 1970 respondents as compared with only 19% of the 1968 respondents said they did not know a single white person well ($X^2 = 11.48$; df = 1; $p < .005$). On the other hand, 48% of the 1970 respondents as compared with only 11% of the 1968 respondents said they knew five or more white persons well ($X^2 = 96.85$; df = 1; $p < .001$).

In response to the item on liking for whites, however, there was no difference between the two samples; in 1968 40% of the respondents, as compared with 38% in 1970, said they liked "almost all" or "most" of the whites whom they had met, and the number of students in each sample who responded "almost all" or "most" was about three times greater than the corresponding number who responded "hardly any" or "none" ($X^2 = .11$; df = 1; $p > .10$; $X^2 = .00$; df = 1; $p > .10$).

With regard to trust in whites, the percentage of respondents who trusted 51% or more of whites dropped from 26% in 1968 to 14% in 1970 ($X^2 = 7.83$; df = 1; $p < .01$); correspondingly, in 1968 37% of our respondents felt they could trust 10% or fewer whites, as compared with 46% in 1970 ($X^2 = 4.54$; df = 1; $p < .05$).[2]

With regard to expectations concerning separatism, the percentage of respondents who felt it was either "Certain," "Almost certain," or "Probable" that the U. S. would be "separated into two nations" decreased from 27% in 1968 to 17% in 1970 ($X^2 = 19.04$; df = 1; $p < .001$).

The percentage who thought that such separatism would be either "Desirable" or "Very desirable" decreased, from 14% in 1968 to only 07% in 1970 ($X^2 = 6.76$; df = 1; $p. < 01$). However, the percentage of respondents who thought "separation into two nations" was "Very undesirable" also decreased from 31% to 25 % ($X^2 = 6.42$; df = 1; $p < .025$), and the percentage who said they were "Unsure" increased from 25% to 35% ($X^2 = 4.54$; df = 1; $p < .05$). These data indicated that black youth in Kansas City may have become less polarized and more uncertain in their views on the desirability of separatism between 1968 and 1970.

With regard to expectations that the problems between whites and blacks will be peacefully solved, however, the proportion of respondents who said "Probably not" or "Definitely not" increased from 41% in 1968 to 50% in 1970 ($X^2 = 4.12$; df = 1; $p < .05$).

With regard to willingness to live in an integrated neighborhood, the proportion of respondents who said either "Definitely not" or "Probably not" decreased from 14% in 1968 to 09% in 1970, but this difference was not significant at the .05 level Similarly, the proportion of respondents who felt that it was "Very Undesirable" or "Somewhat Undesirable" to achieve integrated housing dropped from 40% to 32%, but again the difference was not statistically significant. In both samples, a large majority of students said they were willing to live in integrated housing, but only one-fourth to one-third placed enough stress on this goal to consider it "Desirable" or "Very desirable."

With regard to opportunities for the future, the proportion of respondents who felt their opportunities were either "Good" or "Very good" increased from 72% in 1968 to 80% in 1970 ($X^2 = 5.42$; df = 1; $p < .025$). In 1970, only three respondents felt their opportunities for the future were "Poor" or "Very poor." However, it was also found that male respondents in the 1970 sample tended to see their opportunities for the future as better than did female respondents ($r_{pb} = .21$.)[3] Since the 1970 sample contained six percent more male respondents than did the 1968 sample, it is possible that the difference in sex composition accounts for the difference in responses between 1968 and 1970. Since we are not treating a difference as reliable in this type of situation unless the probability level of its occurring by chance is .01 or less, we therefore cannot conclude that views on opportunities toward the future became more optimistic between 1968 and 1970. In addition, it also should be kept in mind that the proportions of respondents who viewed their opportunities for the future as being "Poor" or "Very Poor" were very small in both samples (07% and 02%, respectively).

---

[2] There is no necessary contradiction between our findings that number of whites known well is associated with trust in whites and that trust in whites decreased between 1968 and 1970 even though there was not a consistent decrease in number of whites known well. For one thing, there are other considerations besides number of whites known well that affect trust in whites; even so, the decline in trust in whites noted in our data easily may be associated primarily with the increase in percentage of respondents who do not know a single white person well which is evident in our more polarized 1970 sample.

[3] In the 1968 sample sex was not related to perception of opportunities for the future.

With regard to the quality of local facilities and services, definite decreases occurred between 1968 and 1970 in the percentages of respondents who rated employment services as "Very Poor or "Poor" ($X^2 = 31.71$; df = 1; $p < .001$) and police services as "Very Poor" ($X^2 = 9.62$; df = 1; $p < .005$). The decline in "Very poor" or "Poor" ratings of employment services and facilities was from 39% to 23%. The decline in "Very poor" ratings of police services was from 34% to 21%.

Between 1968 and 1970 there was a very marked increase of 23 points in the percentage of students who responded affirmatively to the question, "Do you feel you live in a ghetto?" ($X^2 = 17.35$; df = 1; $p < .001$). Most of this increase was accounted for by a decline of 20 points in the percentage of respondents scored as "Unsure or undecided." Because it is possible that differences in the way responses were obtained[4] and in the sequence in which items were placed on the questionnaire may have been responsible for much of this discrepancy between the 1968 and the 1970 data, it is difficult to be sure that the finding is reliable and even more difficult to interpret it. On the other hand, we also found that the percentage of students who said their neighbors "Seldom" or "Very Seldom" felt safe in their neighborhood increased from 11% in 1968 to 19% in 1970 ($X^2 = 5.97$; df = 2, $p < .025$), thus suggesting that changes in general perceptions toward ghetto neighborhoods in Kansas City did occur between 1968 and 1970. The general question of whether perceptions and definitions of living in a ghetto are changing among black youth in Kansas City and elsewhere may be an important one to pursue in future research.

With regard to the item, "What do you think is the most important reason why some black citizens have engaged in violence?", the percentage of students who thought the motivation behind violence had been "to gain equal rights" increased from 06% in 1968 to 51% in 1970, and a corresponding drop occured in the percentage who attributed violence to revenge motives.[5] This finding suggests that Lincoln students may have responded uniquely in 1968 because their school was the center of a civil disturbance and that the saliency of their unique experience may have receded in the next two years.[6] This possibility in turn suggests the hypothesis that as black youngsters in an urban ghetto become further removed in time and space from a civil disturbance, they become less likely to see the disturbance as "illegitimately" motivated by determination to attain equal rights. Although the responses from students in Deep South City also suggested the same hypothesis, we have no adequate way to test it with our data and therefore recommend that it be tested more explicitly in future research.

---

[4] This item was changed from open-ended in 1968 to multiple-choice in 1970.

[5] This item was one of those on which Lincoln differed significantly from the other two schools in 1968; accordingly, in this paragraph, we have compared the 1970 data with the 1968 Lincoln data.

[6] In 1968 Lincoln students were much less likely to see themselves as "ever participating in a future riot" than were students in the other two schools.

With respect to attitudes related to fatalism and personal control over one's future, decreases in fatalistic responses were registered on two of the three items dealing with these types of attitudes. On the item, "People like me don't have much chance in life," the proportion of respondents who answered "Agree very much," "Agree," or "Not sure" relative to those who answered "Disagree" or "Disagree very much" decreased from 25% in 1968 to 17% in 1970 ($X^2 = 4.07$; df = 1; $p < .05$). On the item, "Good luck is more important than hard work for success," the proportion who answered "Agree" or "Agree very much" relative to those who answered "Disagree," "Disagree very much," or "Not sure" decreased from 14% in 1968 to 08% in 1970 ($X^2 = 4.37$; df = 1; $p < .05$). On the item "My experience makes me feel that life is not worth living," however, there was no significant change in the proportion of respondents answering "Never" or "Rarely" relative to those answering "once in a while," "Sometimes," "Seldom," or "Very Seldom" between 1968 and 1970 ($X^2 = .88$; df = 1; $p \quad .05$). On two of the three items, therefore, statistically significant decreases at the .05 level occurred in the tendency to agree with statements indicating that a respondent perceives himself as having little chance to succeed in life by working hard to improve his future.

It should be specially noted that while only a minority of either the 1968 or 1970 respondents actually agreed with any of the statements denoting fatalism and a sense of powerlessness in one's personal life, previous research has indicated that items of this nature are quite discriminating in the sense that small differences have been shown to be predictive of social disorganization, achievement in school, and other social processes. That is, even twenty-five percent agreement with an item like "People like me don't have much chance in life," is indicative of significant differences in their attitudes and behaviors in social institutions such as the school. By the same token, a decrease of only five or six percentage points in the percentage of respondents willing to select fatalistic responses to such items may be indicative of real and important shifts in their attitudes and outlook.

To summarize differences found between our 1968 and 1970 Kansas City samples, we can report that black youth surveyed in 1970 were: more polarized in high- and low-contact-with-whites groups; more distrustful toward whites; less expectant that white and black communities in the United States would become fully separate and more ambivalent about such separation; less expectant that problems between blacks and whites will be resolved peacefully; less negative about employment services and police services available to black people in Kansas City; more inclined to see themselves as living in a ghetto and less disposed to see their neighborhoods as safe for their neighbors; less likely to perceive civil disturbance in black communities as motivated by revenge and more likely to perceive it as part of a struggle for equal rights; and less likely to perceive themselves as fatalistically trapped in circumstances which make it unreasonable to work hard or strive for succes. For reasons which have been described in the text, we are confident that these differences are reliable in the sense that they reflect real changes which have been occurring in the attitudes and viewpoints of black youth in Kansas City.

We cannot be sure just what these differences may mean, though they obviously may be of considerable importance. The increases of 68% and 24% which occurred, respectively, in the percentage of respondents who said they did not know a single white person well and did not trust even 11% of whites probably will be viewed as ominous by most readers. The decreases which occurred in fatalism and in extremely negative perceptions toward employment and police services, on the other hand, probably will be generally viewed as encouraging. Depending on one's ideology, the change in support for separatism and the increased tendency to perceive civil disturbance as motivated by a struggle for equal rights may be viewed as desirable or undesirable. The increases which occurred in expectations that black-white problems will not be peacefully resolved and in perceptions of living in an unsafe ghetto may mean merely that black youth in Kansas City were more realistic in these respects in 1970 than they were in 1968; then again, they may also prefigure either further alienation or increases in determination to work hard in the future for peaceful social change as well as for improvements in predominantly black neighborhoods.

Changes which occurred between 1968 and 1970 in the perceptions and attitudes of black youth in our Kansas City samples also should be seen in the larger context of overall attitude patterns and levels of response which did not fundamentally change and of the similarities and differences discovered among the cities included in this study. For example, even though trust in whites decreased between 1968 and 1970, on the average Kansas City respondents still were somewhat less distrusting of whites in 1970 than were respondents in the other four cities. But it also should be kept in mind that several of the changes in attitudes described in this section moved in the direction of closer agreement with response levels reported in the other three northern cities. To the degree that the attitudes of youth are influenced by national developments and national media, the attitudes of black youth in Kansas City might be expected to become less discrepant from those of black youth in other cities in the future.

To the extent, however, that attitudes are formulated primarily out of experience in local situations, the attitudes of black youth in Kansas City may or may not change and the trends we have noted in this section may or may not continue, depending on how the social environment in Kansas City develops in the next few years. For example, if the ghetto continues to grow larger and black youth become still more socially isolated, other things being equal black students in Kansas City can be expected to become more supportive of separatism. If police-community relations improve, on the other hand, this might contribute at least slightly to a lessening of separatism tendencies. Further research conducted a year or two from now should reveal fairly clearly whether and in what ways black youth in Kansas City may be moving steadily closer toward the attitudes of their counterparts in larger cities like Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City.

IX. Attitudes Toward Whites and Number of Whites Known Well

As in our previous study of black students in Kansas City, Missouri, we were interested in determining whether respondents who reported they knew many whites well had more favorable attitudes toward whites than respondents with little or no such contact. The previous study had concluded that

> . . . although a large proportion of black students in Kansas City has had few meaningful contacts with white persons and generally is highly distrustful of whites, among those who have had such contact a complex, circular process has occurred wherein underlying distrust and antipathy often have given way to a willingness to treat white persons on their individual merits and a reduced reluctance to have further contact with whites. Although the majority of respondents in our sample of black students do not know as many as eleven whites well, most have had sufficient contact with whites to recognize that white people are not all alike and to have met at least some whites with whom they have established positive personal relationships. Contact with whites, trust in whites, and non-hostile attitudes toward whites are part of an interrelated process which plays an important role in shaping the interracial orientations and relationships of black students growing up in a segregated neighborhood.[1]

The approach used in studying interracial attitudes and contact in the present study as well as in the previous one was to examine the cross-sectional relationships between self-reported attitudes toward whites and number of whites known well. The items used to assess these variables were, "Do you like the average white person you have met?", "How many white people would you say you know well?", and "About what percentage of whites do you feel you can trust?".

Examination of the relationships between these items quickly showed that responses on each of the three variables were related to responses on the other two. That is, *liking for whites*[2] as measured by the item, "Do you like the average white person you have met" is positively associated with *trust in whites* as measured by the item, "About what percentage of whites do you feel you can trust?". For example, among respondents who trust only 0-10% of whites, 60% say they like "Few," "Hardly any," or "None" of the whites whom they have met, whereas 59% of the respondents who said they trust 41% or more of whites reported liking "Almost all" or "Most" of the whites whom they have met. Similarly, *liking for whites* is positively associated with *number of whites known well* (66% of the respondents who know no whites well like "Few," "Hardly any," or "None" of the whites they have met, as compared with a corresponding figure of only 32% among those who know five or more whites well), and *trust in whites* is positively associated with *number of whites known well.*

---

[1] Daniel U. Levine, Norman S. Fiddmont, and Janet E. New, "Interracial Attitudes and Contact Among Black and White Students in a Metropolitan Area." Kansas City, Missouri: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, n.d. (mimeo) p. 5.

[2] In this section and the following two sections on interrelationships among attitudes, variables cited in a given analysis are italicized for the convenience of the reader.

To find a positive association between two variables such as number of persons in another group known well and attitude toward members of that group does not necessarily mean, of course, that it is knowing members of the other group that generates favorable attitudes toward them; such a relationship may be explained equally well by the assumption that favorable attitudes toward the other group lead to knowing more members of the other group, or the relationship may be caused by some third variable that affects both of those which are found to be correlated. Similarly, it is not possible to know for sure whether trust in whites leads to greater liking for whites or whether liking tends to generate greater trust, or both. All that can be said for sure with non-longitudinal contingency data of this type is that two variables seem to be either related or unrelated to one another, but the direction and genesis of such relationships cannot be conclusively determined from the nature of the data.

However, it is possible to further examine the interrelationships among three or more variables in order to speculate on the dynamics that appear to account most reasonably for the relationships observed. The basic strategy used in this part of the present study was to learn more about the underlying relationships between the variables in carrying out three-way tabulations and determining whether two variables continued to be associated when account thus was taken of the effect of the third. Results of the three-way tabulations for the three items described above are shown in Table 6.

Analysis ot Table 6 shows that:

1. For each of the three groups classified by number of whites known well, there is an association between liking for whites and trust in whites (6a). Among respondents who say they know five or more whites well, for example, only 23% of those who trust 0 to 10% of whites say they like "Almost all" or "Most" of the white people they have met, as compared with 70% of those who trust 40% or more of whites.

2. For each of the three groups of respondents classified by trust in whites, those who know 5 or more whites well are more likely to say they like whites than are respondents who say they know fewer whites well (6b). For example, among respondents who trust 41% or more of whites, 41% of those who know no whites well say they like "Almost all" or "Most" of the white people whom they have met, as compared with 70% of those who know five or more whites well.

3. For two of the three groups of respondents classified by liking for whites, number of whites known well is associated with trust in whites (6c). Among respondents who say they like "Few," "Hardly any," or "None" of the whites whom they have met, for example, 88% of those who do not know any whites well trust 10% or less of the whites whom they have met, as compared with 67% of those who say they know five or more whites well. This relationship does not hold, however, in the case of respondents who reported they liked "Some" of the whites whom they have met.

4. Taken together, the results of these three tabulations suggest that two contrasting syndromes are at work among the respondents in our sample. On the one hand, there are respondents who trust whites, know many whites well, and like the whites they have met. On the other hand are respondents who know few whites well and do not trust whites or like those they have met. In the former group there are 45 respondents who say they like "Almost all" or "Most" of the whites they have met, trust 41% or more whites, and know 5 or more whites well. In the latter

TABLE 6

Relationship Between Attitude Toward Whites, Trust in Whites, and Number of Whites Known Well (N = 574)

6a

How Many White People Would You Say You Know Well?

Do You Like the Average White Whom You Have Met?	None						1-4						5 or More					
	Almost all or Most		Some		Few, Hardly any, or None		Almost all or Most		Some		Few Hardly any or None		Almost all or Most		Some		Few Hardly any, or None	
About What Percentage of Whites Do You Feel You Can Trust?	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
0-10%	06	(10)	21	(38)	63	(131)	11	(11)	33	(32)	55	(53)	23	(24)	34	(36)	43	(46)
11-40%	14	(4)	34	(10)	52	(15)	30	(6)	25	(5)	45	(9)	43	(23)	30	(16)	26	(14)
41% or more	41	(7)	41	(7)	18	(3)	20	(2)	70	(7)	10	(1)	70	(45)	16	(10)	14	(09)
	$X^2 = 23.28$; df = 2; $p < .001$						$X^2 = 5.98$; df = 2; $p < .025$						$X^2 = 38.59$; df = 4; $p < .001$					

6b

About What Percentage of Whites Do You Feel You Can Trust?

Do You Like the Average White Person You Have Met?	0-10%						11-40%						41% or more					
	Almost all or Most		Some		Few Hardly any, or None		Almost all or Most		Some		Few Hardly any, or None		Almost all or Most		Some		Few Hardly any, or None	
How Many White People Would You Say You Know Well?	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
None	06	(10)	21	(38)	63	(131)	14	(4)	34	(10)	52	(15)	41	(7)	41	(7)	18	(3)
1-4	11	(11)	33	(32)	55	(53)	30	(6)	25	(5)	45	(9)	20	(2)	70	(7)	10	(1)
5 or more	23	(24)	34	(36)	43	(46)	43	(23)	30	(16)	26	(14)	70	(45)	16	(10)	14	(9)
	$X^2 = 32.04$; df = 4; $p > .001$						$X^2 = 7.64$; df = 2; $p < .025$						$X^2 = 13.83$; df = 2; $p < .005$					

6c

Do You Like the Average White Person You Have Met?

About What Percentage of Whites Do You Feel You Can Trust?	Almost all or Most						Some						Few, Hardly any, or None					
	0-10%		11-40%		41% or More		0-10%		11-40%		41% or More		0-10%		11-40%		41% or More	
How Many White People Would You Say You Know Well?	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
None	48	(10)	19	(04)	33	(7)	69	(38)	18	(10)	13	(7)	88	(131)	10	(15)	02	(3)
1-4	58	(11)	32	(06)	11	(2)	73	(32)	11	(05)	16	(7)	84	(53)	14	(9)	02	(1)
5 or more	25	(24)	26	(23)	49	(45)	58	(36)	26	(16)	16	(10)	67	(46)	20	(14)	13	(9)
	$X^2 = 9.12$; df = 2; $p < .01$						$X^2 = 4.08$; df = 4; n.s.						$X^2 = 14.62$; df = 2; $p < .001$					

group are 131 respondents who say they do not know any whites well, trust 10% or less of whites, and like "Few," "Hardly any," or "None" of the whites whom they have met. Together, these two groups constitute 30% of our entire sample.

Further evidence that the two contrasting syndromes are operating among the respondents in our sample is provided by the finding that trust in whites and number of whites known well were related among respondents who like "Almost all" or "Most" whites or like "Few," "Hardly any," or "None" of the whites they have met but not among respondents who like "Some" whites. Respondents who say they like "Some" whites, in other words, appear to be a "swing" group in the sense that those who trust or distrust whites do not necessarily know many or few whites well, and vice versa; as liking or disliking for whites solidifies, however, so, too, does the tendency to trust whites and get to know them well on the one hand or to distrust whites and avoid close personal relationships with them on the other.

It also should be noted that the number of respondents (131) exemplifying the syndrome of dislike for whites, distrust of whites, and few whites known well is nearly three times as large as the number (45) exemplifying the syndrome of trust in whites, liking for whites, and many whites known well. This finding raises the important issue of whether the former group is so large primarily because respondents have had negative personal relationships with whites, or, alternately, because they have had little opportunity for positive relationships with whites. Although we have no explicit measure of whether this group of respondents has tended to have had negative contact with whites or has had limited relationships with whites, our data do allow us to speculate that for the sample as a whole the limited opportunities explanation is more plausible than is the negative contact explanation.[3] Our primary reason for reaching this conclusion is that if the syndrome of distrust-dislike - few whites known well is being generated primarily in negative relationships with whites, we would not have expected so high a percentage (52%) of the 281 respondents who said they liked "Few," "Hardly any," or "None" of the whites they had met to have said that they did not know even one white person well. In addition, it is more parsimonious to conclude that in general the group of 131 respondents who distrust and dislike whites and say they know no whites well is more likely to have had limited rather than negative contact with whites while attending unquestionably segregated schools and, presumably, living in segregated neighborhoods. Although it is important to re-emphasize the facts that contingency data of the type reported in this section do not unambiguously allow for causal interpretation and that longitudinal data would be required to justify more conclusive interpretations than we have offered here, nevertheless the patterns in our data do suggest that distrust of whites and dislike of whites among respondents in our overall sample are rooted more frequently in lack of contact than in negative contact with whites.

---

[3] As noted below, however, there is some reason to believe that in two cities (Eastern City and Deep South City), negative relationships with whites may be a more prevalent force in generating the syndrome than is true in the other three cities.

Inter-city patterns

In contrast to our previous study of Kansas City students in which it was found that a majority of respondents tended to be more trustful than distrustful toward whites, in the present study a clear majority of 66% of the respondents in our total sample (Table 1) trust 10% or fewer whites. Examination of the school-by-school data showed that it was the deep south school in which respondents were overwhelmingly distrustful of whites across-the-board (86% who responded trusted 10% or fewer whites), and that Kansas City students were significantly less likely to say they trusted 10% or fewer whites than did respondents in the other three northern cities.[4] (Of the five cities, Kansas City was the only city in which more than half the respondents trusted 11% or more of whites.)

As one would expect given the association already reported between trust in whites and liking for whites, students in Deep South City and students in the Kansas City sample also differed significantly on liking for whites from students in the remaining three large cities: 66% of the respondents in Deep South City reported that they liked "Few," "Hardly any," or "None" of the whites they had met, as compared with 40% of respondents in the remaining three cities and 28% in Kansas City.[5] In the case of number of whites known well, however, the pattern was somewhat different; here the Kansas City sample, as expected, was highest on number of whites known well, but it was Upper Midwestern City rather than the Deep South City in which the lowest amount of contact was reported (Deep South City ranked 3rd out of 5 on this variable). City-by-city data on this variable are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Selected Data on Number of Whites Known Well by City

City	Percent Who Know No Whites or One White Well	Percent Who Know Five or More Whites Well	Average Number of Whites Known Well*
Kansas City	41	49	3.8
Eastern City	44	44	3.6
Deep South City	52	35	3.0
Lower Midwestern City	53	26	2.6
Upper Midwestern City	62	23	2.3

*To compute averages, scores in the 3-4 category were counted as 3.5, scores in the 5-6 category were counted as 5.5, and scores in the 7 or more category were counted as 8. All differences between adjacent schools except that between the Kansas City and the Eastern City samples were significant at the .05 level or beyond using Chi square to test the differences in distributions across five response categories.

---

[4] Forty-five percent of the 159 Kansas City respondents as compared with 62% of 287 respondents in the three larger cities gave this response ($X^2 = 10.62$; df =1; $p < .005$). The difference between the deep south sample and the three-city sample was significant at the .001 level ($X^2 = 32.64$; df = 1).

[5] The difference between the deep south sample and the three-city sample was significant at the .001 level ($X^2 = 32.64$; df = 1). The difference between the Kansas City sample and the three-city sample was significant at the .05 level ($X^2 = 7.08$; df = 1).

If the interpretations outlined above concerning the relationships between number of whites known well and attitudes toward whites are correct, one would expect to find that both number of whites known well and trust in whites play a part in determining whether black youth in segregated schools have positive feelings about the whites they have met. That is, students must have contact with whites and also must overcome a basic distrust of whites before experiencing favorable feelings toward whites. As a test of this interpretation we examined the school-by-school patterns on all three variables (Table 8).

TABLE 8

Patterns of Response by City on the Variables Contact with Whites, Trust in Whites, and Liking for Whites

City	Average Number of Whites Known Well*	Percent Who Trust 10% or Fewer Whites	Percent Who Like Almost all or Most Whites
Kansas City	3.8	46	38
Eastern City	3.6	66	29
Deep South City	3.0	86	11
Lower Midwestern City	2.6	56	27
Upper Midwestern City	2.3	60	26

*See note in Table 7.

The data in Table 8 tend to support the conclusion that contact with whites (as indicated by number of whites known well) and trust in whites both must be present to produce liking for whites among black students in segregated environments. As a group, respondents in Kansas City score relatively high on contact with whites and relatively low on distrust of whites (compared to the other schools), and the percent of respondents who say they like "Almost all" or "Most" whites is higher in Kansas City than in any of the other cities except Eastern City.[5] Respondents in Eastern City have almost as much contact with whites as Kansas City respondents, but two-thirds of them still distrust 90% or more whites, and the percentage who like "Almost all" or "Most" whites is not much higher than in the other two large cities. Respondents in Deep South City are overwhelmingly distrustful of whites,[6] and the percentage favorable toward whites is lowest of any school in the sample. The fact that Eastern City respondents score relatively high on contact with whites but score second highest on distrust in whites and do not approach the Kansas City sample on liking for whites suggests that contact with whites frequently does not result in liking for whites unless preceded by the development of a sense of trust.

---

[5] The difference between Kansas City and Eastern City on liking for whites was just short of significance at the .05 level. ($X^2 = 3.40$, df = 1).

[6] The difference between Deep South City and Upper Midwestern City on liking for whites was significant at the .01 level ($X^2 = 16.30$, df = 5).

in Eastern City, clearly, the relatively high level of contact with whites reported by respondents in our sample frequently has not overcome (or has helped produce) a basically distrustful orientation toward whites. This finding in turn suggests that respondents in Eastern City may be experiencing more negative contact with whites than are respondents in the other three northern cities.

Given the nature of race relations and the history of overt racial subjugation of blacks in the south, it is not difficult to explain the pattern found among respondents in Deep South City. Students in this sample did report having a moderate amount of contact with whites, but much of this contact apparently is negative and in any case does little if anything to moderate their pervasive distrust of whites.

Partial correlations between number of whites known well, liking for whites, and trust in whites also were computed and are shown in Table 9. The patterns shown in Table 9 suggest that liking for whites is a mediating variable between trust in whites and number of whites known well. For the sample as a whole, the zero-order correlation between trust in whites and number of whites known well is reduced by nearly half when account is taken of liking for whites, while the first-order correlations between trust in whites and liking for whites and between liking for whites and number of whites known well are reduced only moderately when account is taken of the third variable. The low zero-order correlation (.18) between trust in whites and number of whites known well among respondents in Eastern City is compatible with our speculation that respondents in that city may be experiencing more negative contact with whites than is the case in the other four cities. We know of no particular reason that might explain why the zero-order correlation between number of whites known well and liking for whites in Lower Midwestern City is so low to begin with and disappears entirely when account is taken of trust in whites. This finding does suggest the conclusion, however, that for some unknown reason number of whites known well is not as closely associated with liking for whites in Lower Midwestern City as in the other four schools in the sample.

TABLE 9

Zero-Order and Partial Correlations Between Trust in Whites, Number of Whites Known Well, and Liking for Whites, by School

A = trust in whites; B = Number of Whites Known Well; C = Liking for Whites

	AB	BC	AC	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A
Kansas City	.34	.49	.42	.17	.31	.41
Eastern City	.18	.47	.42	.03	.39	.33
Deep South City	.29	.46	.25	.20	.14	.42
Upper MW City	.56	.44	.48	.44	.31	.24
Lower MW City	.31	.17	.46	.26	.43	.03
Total Sample	.32	.42	.44	.17	.36	.33

To sum up, the patterns delineated in this section suggest the following conclusions concerning tendencies related to interracial attitudes and contacts among our sample of black students from five cities.

1. Respondents in Deep South City have a moderate amount of contact with whites relative to other cities in our sample but much of this contact is negative and further deepens an intially pervasive distrust of whites.

2. Respondents in Upper Midwestern City and Lower Midwestern City have little contact with whites relative to the other cities and consequently have few opportunities to develop either trust or positive feelings toward whites.

3. Respondents in Eastern City have relatively high contact with whites but much of this contact is negative and therefore does relatively little to overcome feelings of distrust and dislike for whites. This inference is further supported by the data in Table 10, which shows the proportions of respondents who trusted 10% or less of whites after respondents in each sample were sorted into two groups composed of those who did and did not know more than two whites well. As shown in Table 10, Eastern City was the only city in which there was not a statistically significant difference at or beyond the .025 level in percentage of whites trusted between the two groups classified by number of whites known well. A closer examination of the percentages shows that Eastern City was the only northern city in which a majority of respondents who knew two or more whites well did not trust 11% or more of whites. At a minimum,this pattern indicates that Eastern City respondents who have appreciable contact with whites for some reason are not as likely to trust whites as are respondents who have this much contact with whites in the other northern cities.

TABLE 10

Percentages of Respondents Who Trust 10% or Less of Whites, by Number of Whites Known Well

	Kansas City	Eastern City	Deep South City	Upper Midwest City	Lower Midwest City
Respondents who know 0-2 whites well	55	75	95	72	73
Respondents who know 2 or more whites well	29	62	75	32	35
X^2 and p with 1 df	15.21; $< .001$	2.00; $< .25$	12.78; $< .001$	9.06; $< .005$	6.39; $< .025$

X. Attitudes Regarding the Desirability of Separatism and Orientation Toward Whites

Like trust in whites, attitude regarding the desirability of separatism constitutes another variable which reasonably might be expected to be related to attitudes of liking or disliking toward whites and to number of whites known well. For example, it is plausible to predict that black youth who know few whites well might be more inclined to support separatism than do those who know many whites, and it seems reasonable to expect that black youth who say they dislike whites will be more supportive of separatism than will those who tend to like the whites they have met.

Our previous study of Kansas City students in 1968 showed a slight tendency for number of whites known well, liking for whites, and desirability of separatism to interact in the sense that respondents who knew many whites well tended to say they liked the whites they had met and those who liked the whites they had met tended to be less supportive of separatism than those who disliked whites. Because this pattern indicated the possible operation of a two-step attitude-formation process leading from contact with whites to liking for whites to views on separatism, we speculated that the stage between contact with whites and liking for whites might be one during which negative stereotypes about whites were being overcome, resulting ultimately in a lessening of support for separatist philosophies. However, the relationship between liking for whites and desirability of separatism with number of whites known well controlled was neither strong nor consistent; for this reason we were not sure whether the same relationship would appear using the larger and more diverse sample in the present study.

To explore this question, three-way tabulations were carried out[1] using responses to the three items, "Do you feel this (separation into two nations, one black and one white) would be desirable or undesirable?", "How many white people would you say you know well?", and "Do you like the average white person you have met?" These tabulations indicated that:

1. Number of whites known well and liking for whites remained highly and consistently related in a positive direction when respondents were classified in three groups according to whether they said separation was "Very desirable" or "Desirable," said they were "Unsure," or said separation was "Undesirable" or "Very undesirable."

2. Responses regarding the desirability of separatism were not related to responses concerning numbers of whites known well when account was taken of liking for whites.

3. Responses regarding the desirability of separatism were not related to responses concerning liking for whites when account was taken of number of whites known well.

In addition to these three-way tabulations, responses regarding the desirability of separatism also were examined for possible zero-order associations with each of the other two variables considered separately.[2] In each case, desirability of separatism was significantly related to the other variable. With regard to number of whites known well, it was found that only eight percent of the respondents who said they knew seven or more whites well said they thought separation was "Very desirable" or "Desirable," as compared with 19% of those who did not know a single white well ($X^2 = 10.30$; df = 1; $p < .005$). With regard to liking for whites, it was found that only eight percent of the respondents who said they liked "Almost all" or "Most" of the whites they had met felt that separation was "Very desirable" or "Desirable," as compared with 18% of those who liked "Few," "Hardly any," or "None" of the whites they had met ($X^2 = 7.34$; df = 1; $p < .01$).

---

[1] These tabulations are not shown as a table in the text.

[2] These data are not shown as a table in the text.

Considering these two sets of findings together, our data suggest that both unfavorable personal attitudes toward whites and lack of personal contact with whites may be necessary if these variables are to result in support for separatism. That is, since it was found that liking for whites is not associated with attitude on separatism when number of whites known well is accounted for and that number of whites known well is not associated with attitude on separatism when liking for whites is accounted for, the best way to explain the separate zero-order associations found between attitude regarding the desirability of separatism and the other two variables is to assume that neither liking for whites nor number of whites known well generates rejection of separation in the absence of the other. Conversely, of course, it also is assumed that neither dislike for whites nor lack of personal contact with whites is associated with support for separation in the absence of the other.[3]

To further explore the possible relationships between support for separatism and the variables measuring interracial attitudes and contact, partial and multiple correlations were computed between these variables for students in Upper Midwestern City, where visual inspection indicated that the four variables were more highly associated than in the other cities. These data are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Zero-Order, Partial, and Multiple Correlations Between Items Dealing with the Desirability of Separatism, Trust in Whites, Liking for Whites, and Contact with Whites, for Respondents in Upper Midwestern City*

A = Do you feel this /separation into two nations, one white and one black/ would be desirable or undesirable?
B = Do you like the average white person you have met?
C = About what percentages do you feel you can trust?
D = How many white people would you say you know well?

AB	AC	AD	BD	BD	CD	AD.B	CD.B	AC.B	AD.BC	A.BCD
.35	.55	.33	.46	.44	.56	.21	.44	.47	.00	.56

*Although the N's varied slightly from one calcuation to another, most of the correlations are based on N's of 85 to 90.

---

[3] More complicated explanations also might account for these relationships. For example, it is possible that a fourth variable related to the three considered here might be primarily responsible for the relationships described in this section.

As shown in Table 11, the multiple correlation between attitudes regarding desirability of separatism and the other three variables in Upper Midwestern City was .56. That is, knowledge of responses regarding liking for whites, trust in whites, and number of whites known well in Upper Midwestern City would have enabled us to predict 31% of the variance in responses regarding desirability of separatism. A multiple correlation of this magnitude is quite high considering the amount of error and noise inevitably found in data of the kind we are working with in the present study; it indicates that at least in some cities, support for separatism among black youth is fairly closely associated with interracial attitudes and experience.

Closer examination of the data in Table 11 indicates that the zero-order correlation of .33 between desirability of separatism and number of whites known well was reduced to .21 when account was taken of liking for whites and was further reduced to .00 when account was taken of both liking for whites and trust in whites. These findings suggest that both liking for whites and trust in whites are intervening variables between desirability of separatism and number of whites known well. However, the smallness of the reduction to .47 in the zero-order correlation of .55 between desirability of separatism and trust in whites when liking for whites was accounted for suggests that trust in whites is more closely related to separatism than is liking for whites.

Although these data apply only to Upper Midwestern City and, as before, cannot reveal whether support for separatism tends more to result from or to shape interracial attitudes and experience, they do suggest that interracial contact and attitudes may play an important part in determining whether most black youth will continue to reject separatism in the future.

As described earlier, analysis of the differences in responses between students in Kansas City and Lower Midwestern City on the one hand and Eastern City and Upper Midwestern City on the other showed that there was more support for separatism in the latter two cities than in the former two. This finding suggests that support for separatism also may be associated with size of city and/or regional location, thus indicating that separatism is a complex phenomena which is affected by local conditions other than those directly involving interracial attitudes and contacts.

XI. Additional Relationships Among Attitudes

To further explore the meaning of the responses to the attitude items, Pearson product moment correlations were computed between many sets of items. In one set of comparisons, these correlations were between trust in whites, number of whites known well, and liking for whites on the one hand and four other attitude items dealing with views on non-violence, attitudes toward the police, and attitudes regarding separatism on the other. These correlations are shown in Table 12. Correlations are shown for each of the five schools and for the sample as a whole.

Several general conclusions about the cities in the sample which stand out in Table 12 are as follows:

1. In terms of influencing or being influenced by civil rights and race relations attitudes, orientation toward whites seems to be more salient for students in Upper Midwestern City than in the other four cities. In eight of the twelve groups of correlations, the correlations for Upper Midwestern City are larger than for any other city; in some cases, they are considerably larger, and in several cases they are the only statistically significant correlations found in the data.

2. Correlations in Deep South City tend to be near zero. In general, Table 12 suggests that knowledge of orientation toward whites among Deep South City respondents would not enable one to predict much about their views on civil rights and race relations. In part, this is probably due to the restricted range of the data on trust in whites (86% of the respondents trust 10% or fewer whites) and liking for whites (only 11% liked "Almost all" or "Most" whites) among Deep South City respondents.

3. Except for Upper Midwestern City, responses regarding the desirability of separatism are about equally correlated (or uncorrelated) with trust in whites, number of whites known well, and liking for whites. Among respondents in Upper Midwestern City, the correlation between rejection of separatism and trust in whites is .55, as compared with respective correlations of .33 and .35 between attitude on separatism and the remaining two orientation variables. This finding suggests that trust in whites is a particularly critical factor in the attitudinal development of students in Upper Midwestern City.

Expectations regarding race relations

For four of the five schools and for the sample as a whole, the correlations between trust in whites and liking for whites on the one hand and responses to the item asking whether "problems between blacks and whites will be solved in a peaceful and constructive way" on the other were considerably higher than the correlations between responses to the item and number of whites known well. (Lower Midwestern City was an exception in that there was no correlation between trust in whites and responses to the item). This finding suggests that trust in whites and liking for whites may help generate optimism about the future of race relations among black youth in segregated schools or that pessimism about the future of race relations may generate distrust and dislike of whites. Number of whites known well, however, apparently is not associated with optimism about the future of race relations, except indirectly as it may lead to an increase or decrease in trust and liking for whites.[1]

---

[1] The partial correlation analysis shown in Table 13 also supported this conclusion.

TABLE 12

Pearson Product Moment Correlations Between Selected Items Involving Orientation toward Whites and Attitudes Involving Civil Rights and Race Relations, by City

Orientation Toward Whites Items	Do you think our country will be separated into two nations, one black and one white?	Do you feel this would be desirable or undesirable?	How do you feel about the ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people?	Do you think the problems between blacks and whites will be solved in a peaceful and constructive way?
About what percentage of whites do you feel you can trust?				
Kansas City	.03	.29	.09	.18
Eastern City	.14	.22	.13	.23
Deep South City	.17	.00	.02	.18
Upper MW City	.19	.55	.13	.40
Lower MW City	.28	.08	-.15	.04
Total	.14	.23	.06	.20
How many white people would you say you know well?				
Kansas City	.05	.20	.19	.10
Eastern City	.07	.20	-.02	.10
Deep South City	.05	-.06	.03	.12
Upper MW City	.02	.33	.20	.28
Lower MW City	-.11	.07	-.05	.04
Total	.07	.14	.06	.13
Do you like the average white person you have met?				
Kansas City	.04	.21	.19	.15
Eastern City	.11	.30	.14	.24
Deep South City	-.01	.06	.16	.23
Upper MW City	.08	.35	.20	.48
Lower MW City	.13	.06	.19	.16
Total	.07	.18	.16	.23

A multiple correlation computed separately for respondents in Upper Midwestern City[2] also showed that the variance in the variables *trust in whites*, *liking for whites*, and *number of whites known well* was associated with 27% of the variance in responses on expectations regarding the future of race relations - a finding which tends to support the conclusion that interracial attitudes and experience probably do play a part in affecting the attitudes many black youth hold concerning the future of race relations.

Expectations regarding separatism

For the sample as a whole, distrust of whites was slightly associated with expectations that the "country will be separated into two nations, one black and one white," but there was little or no correlation between *liking for whites* or *number of whites known well* on the one hand and responses to the expectations item on the other. As shown in Table 13, the partial correlation of .12 between *trust in whites* and *expectations regarding separatism* after account was taken of *number of whites known well* was nearly as high as the zero-order correlation of .14. As in the preceding discussion, these patterns suggest that trust in whites may help generate optimism about the future of race relations as measured by expectations that the U. S. will break up into two separate nations, "one black and one white."

Attitudes on non-violence

Agreement with the "ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people" is more closely correlated with *liking for whites* than with *trust in whites* or *number of whites known well*. Although none of the correlations between *attitudes regarding non-violence* and *liking for whites* is greater than .20, the overall correlation of .16 is significant at the .001 level, while the remaining two correlations for the total sample are not statistically significant at the .05 level. In addition, partial-correlation data in Table 13 show that the first-order partial correlations between *liking for whites* and *attitudes regarding non-violence* with account taken of *number of whites known well* (.11; .16; .16; .13; .19; .15) were not appreciably different from the zero-order correlations (Table 12) of .19; .14; .16; .20; .19; and .16, respectively. Thus we conclude that there is a very slight tendency for *liking for whites* but not *trust in whites* or *number of whites known well* to be independently associated with views on whether "non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people."

To further explore possible determinants of attitudes regarding the use of violence "to achieve the goals of black people," partial and multiple correlations for respondents in Lower Midwestern City were computed between responses on this item and responses on the items involving the severity of local job problems, the likelihood that black-white problems would be peacefully resolved, rating of local police services, and perceptions of personal opportunities for the future. Lower Midwestern City was chosen for this analysis because visual inspection indicated that attitudes regarding non-violence were more closely related to other attitudes in this city than in the other cities.[3]

---

[2] This analysis is not shown as a table in the text.

[3] Zero-order correlations between rejection of non-violence and the other attitude variables in Lower Midwestern City were as follows: severity of job problems - .28; expectations regarding peaceful resolution of race problems - .40; adequacy of local police services - .38; and personal opportunities for the future - .31.

TABLE 13

Partial Correlations Between Selected Attitude Items and Number of Whites Known Well, by School

Items

Partial Correlations with Trust in Whites and Number of Whites Known Well;
Item = A; Number of Whites Known Well = B; Trust in Whites = C

	Do you think our country will be separated into two nations, one black and one white?			Do you feel this would be desirable or undesirable?			How do you feel about the idea of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people?			Do you think the problems between blacks and whites will be solved in a peaceful and constructive way?		
	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A
Kansas City	.04	.01	.34	.11	.24	.30	.17	.03	.33	.04	.16	.33
Eastern City	.05	.13	.17	.17	.19	.14	.04	.13	.18	.06	.22	.16
Deep South City	.00	.16	.28				.03	.01	.29	.07	.15	.27
Upper MW City	-.11	.22	.56	.03	.47	.48	.15	.02	.55	.07	.31	.51
Lower MW City	-.22	.33	.36	.05	.06	.31	.00	-.14	.31	.03	.03	.31
Total	.03	.12	.31	.07	.20	.30	.04	.04	.32	.03	.17	.30

Partial Correlations with Liking for Whites and Number of Whites Known Well
Item = A; Number of Whites Known Well = B; Liking for Whites = C.

	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A	AB.C	AC.B	BC.A
Kansas City	.03	.02	.49	.11	.13	.47	.11	.11	.47	.03	.12	.48
Eastern City	.03	.09	.36	.10	.25	.33	-.08	.16	.38	.01	.22	.36
Deep South City	.06	-.04	.46	-.09	.09	.46	-.05	.16	.46	.02	.20	.45
Upper MW City	-.02	.08	.44	.21	.24	.37	.13	.13	.42	.09	.41	.36
Lower MW City	-.13	.15	.19	.06	.05	.17	-.09	.19	.18	.01	.16	.17
Total	.04	.04	.42	.07	.13	.41	-.01	.15	.42	.04	.19	.40

The patterns of partial correlations showed that these variables were independently associated with attitudes regarding non-violence and, except for moderate correlations of .17 and .23 between perception of job problems on the one hand and rating of police services and expectations regarding separatism on the other, were not correlated with each other.[4] The multiple correlation between attitudes regarding non-violence and the variables dealing with perceptions of job problems, rating of police services, and personal opportunities for the future was .56, thus indicating that the variance in these three variables was associated with 31% of the variance in attitudes regarding non-violence in Lower Midwestern City. Similarly, the variables rating of police services, expectations regarding the resolution of racial problems, and personal opportunities for the future predicted 42% of the variance in attitudes regarding non-violence. These results indicate that tendencies to reject non-violence among black youth are independently associated with favorable perceptions regarding local employment and police services as well as positive perceptions of one's opportunities for the future and expectations for a peaceful resolution of black-white problems.[5]

Opportunities for the future

Another attitude which was of particular interest to us involved respondents' views of their personal opportunities for the future. Visual inspection of zero-order correlation data indicated that responses to the item, "Do you feel your opportunities for the future are good?" were associated with responses to the items dealing with liking for whites, the quality of local employment services, and fatalism as tapped by the statement, "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life." Zero-order, partial, and multiple correlations among these variables are shown for each school and the sample as a whole in Table 14.

As shown in Table 14, the multiple correlation between personal opportunities for the future and the other three variables is .35, indicating that 12% of the variance in responses on personal opportunities for the future is associated with variance in the other three variables. The patterns of correlations shown in the table indicate that, fatalism, liking for whites, and quality of local employment services are not closely associated with one another (e.g., the zero-order correlation between liking for whites and the fatalism item is .12 in the total sample; the partial correlation between fatalism and the quality of local employment services with liking for whites accounted for is .09). In no case does holding one variable constant greatly reduce the correlation between two other variables, either for the sample as a whole or any of the individual schools. These results indicate that liking for whites, fatalism, and evaluation of the quality of local employment services for black people each make an independent though small contribution to black students' perceptions of their opportunities for the future.

---

[4] This analysis is not shown as a table in the text.

[5] Because it is difficult to see how attitude regarding non-violence might have a substantial effect on these other attitudes, we believe that the primary direction of causation probably is that the four variables play a part in determining attitudes toward non-violence. It is not possible, however, to establish this conclusively on the basis of correlation data.

TABLE 14

Zero-Order, Partial, and Multiple Correlations Between Items Dealing With Opportunities for the Future, Liking for Whites, Quality of Local Local Employment Services, and Fatalism, by City*

City	AB	AC	AD	BC	BD	CD	AD.B	CD.B	AC.B	AD.BC	A.BCD
Kansas City	.23	.27	.29	.20	.20	.15	.26	.11	.23	.24	.39
Eastern City	.15	.31	.32	.08	.29	.12	.29	.10	.30	.28	.42
Deep South City	-.07	.20	.23	.02	.19	.10	.25	.10	.20	.23	.31
Upper MW City	.27	.28	.17	.07	.27	.04	.10	.02	.27	.10	.39
Lower MW City	.23	.37	.06	.09	.00	.02	.06	.02	.36	.06	.42
Total	.13	.27	.25	.12	.22	.11	.23	.09	.26	.21	.35

*A = Do you feel your opportunities for the future are good?

B = How many white people would you say you know well?

C = People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life.

D = How adequate are employment services or facilities for black people in your city?

The relationship between perceptions of opportunities for the future on the one hand and orientation toward whites and fatalism on the other hand also was underscored by a multiple coorelation analysis computed between responses of Kansas City students on the items dealing with personal opportunities for the future, number of whites known well, and fatalism. Fatalism was measured by the two items "Good luck is more important than hard work for succes," and "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life." The multiple correlation[6] between perceptions of opportunities for the future and the other three items was .51, thus indicating that number of whites known well and fatalism could be used to predict 26% of the variance in perceptions of opportunities for the future among students in Kansas City.

Attitude toward the police

After visual inspection indicated that attitude toward the police as measured by the item, "How would you describe your attitudes toward the police?" was related to responses on the items dealing with interracial attitudes and contact, zero-order, partial, and multiple correlations were computed to determine what could be inferred about the interrelationships between these attitudes.

As shown in Table 15, much of the variance in responses to the item on attitude toward the police is associated primarily with responses to the items dealing with trust in whites and liking for whites.[7]

Closer examination of the data on Upper Midwestern City shows that the zero-order correlation of .32 between attitude toward the police and trust in whites was reduced to .11 by accounting for liking for whites. This pattern suggests that liking for whites is a mediating variable between trust in whites and attitude toward the police in this city. Since Upper Midwestern City was the only city in which there was a sizable zero-order correlation between number of whites known well and attitude toward the police and since the correlation persisted even after accounting for liking for whites, these patterns suggest that number of whites known well is more directly related to attitude toward the police among respondents in Upper Midwestern City than in the other four cities.

Willingness to live in integrated neighborhoods and desirability of integrated housing

Visual inspection indicated that willingness to live in an integrated neighborhood was related more closely to responses on items dealing with the desirability of separatism, attitude toward the police, and expectations regarding the resolution of racial problems than to other items on the questionnaire. Zero-order, partial, and multiple correlations were computed between the four items for respondents in Lower Midwestern City, where the interrelationships between them appeared to be greater than in any of the other cities. The results are shown in Table 16.

---

[6] This analysis is not shown as a table in the text.

[7] Number of whites known well also is related toattitudes toward the police in Upper Midwestern City, where 31% of the variance in responses concerning the police can be explained in terms of the other three items.

TABLE 15

Zero-Order, Partial, and Multiple Correlations Between Items Dealing with Trust in Whites, Number of Whites Known Well, Liking for Whites, and Attitude toward the Police, by City

A = How would you describe your attitudes toward the police?
B = Do you like the average white you have met?
C = How many white people would you say you know well?
D = About what percentage of white people do you feel you can trust?

City	AB	AC	AD	BC	BD	CD	AD.B	CD.B	AC.B	AD.BC	A.BCD
Kansas City	.31	.07	.34	.49	.42	.34	.24	.17	.10	.27	.41
Eastern City	.20	.06	.28	.37	.42	.18	.22	.03	-.01	.22	.30
Deep South City	.26	.13	.16	.46	.25	.29	.10	.20	.01	.10	.28
Upper MW City	.50	.39	.32	.44	.48	.56	.11	.44	.22	-.01	.54
Lower MW City	.46	.04	.25	.17	.46	.31	.05	.27	.04	.06	.46
Total Sample	.24	.11	.20	.42	.44	.32	.11	.17	.01	.10	.26

TABLE 16

Zero-Order, Partial, and Multiple Correlations Between Items Dealing With Willingness to Live in an Integrated Neighborhood, the Desirability of Separatism, Attitude toward the Police, and Expectations Regarding the Future of Race Relations, for Respondents in Lower Midwestern City[a]

A = If the situation arose, would you be willing to live in an integrated neighborhood?
B = Do you feel this /separation into two nations, one white and one black/ would be desirable or undesirable?
C = How would you describe your attitudes toward the police?
D - Do you think the problems between blacks and whites will be solved in a peaceful and constructive way?

AB	AC	AD	BC	BD	CD	AD.B	CD.B	AC.B	AD.BC	A.BCD
.38	.29	.48	.24	.03	.06	.51	.05	.22	.51	.63

[a] The correlations in this table are based on N's which varied from 55 to 60.

As shown in Table 16, the correlation of .29 between willingness to live in integrated neighborhoods and attitude toward the police is reduced to .22 when account is taken of desirability of separatism. The correlation of .48 between willingness to live in integrated neighborhoods and expectations regarding the resolution of racial problems is not reduced when account is taken of attitude regarding separatism and attitude toward the police. These patterns indicate that willingness to live in an integrated neighborhood is independently associated with each of the other three variables. The multiple correlation of .63 indicates that 40% of the variance in response on the item dealing with willingness to live in an integrated neighborhood among respondents in Lower Midwestern City is associated with variance in the other three items.

A similar analysis[8] also was carried out with regard to the item asking respondents how desirable they thought it was to achieve integrated housing rather than their personal willingness to live in an integrated neighborhood. The correlation patterns were similar to those reported in Table 16, except that perceptions regarding the desirability of integrated housing among Lower Midwestern City respondents surprisingly correlated at only .15 with perceptions regarding the desirability of separatism. Thus the patterns indicated that perceptions regarding the desirability of integrated housing were independently associated with attitude toward the police and expectations regarding the resolution of racial problems among respondents in Lower Midwestern City. The multiple correlation of .55 indicated that 30% of the variance in responses regarding the desirability of integrated housing could be accounted for in terms of responses on the other three items.

Rejection of non-violence and fatalism vs. blocked opportunity

Because a study carried out by Ransford[9] after the 1965 civil disturbance in the Watts area in Los Angeles had indicated that sense of powerlessness was one of the variables related to disposition to use violence, we also compared views regarding non-violence of respondents who responded "Agree very much" or "Agree" to the statement, "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life" with the views of respondents who responded "Disagree" or "Disagree very much" with this item. This comparison showed that students who had a high sense of fatalism (i.e., powerlessness) as indicated by agreement with the statement "People like me . . ." were much more likely to disagree with the "ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people" than were respondents with a low sense of fatalism ($X^2 = 10.44$; df = 1; $p < .005$); thus the results supported the conclusion that fatalism is associated with agreement with the use of violence to achieve the goals of black Americans.

Based on information collected from black youth in Detroit before and after the 1967 riot in that city, Forward and Williams have reported data challenging the validity of Ransford's finding of an association between fatalism and support for violence.[10] Forward and Williams began their report by asserting that two fundamental theories have been proposed to account for "riot participation" [support]: the "blocked-opportunity" theory and the "alienation-powerlessness" theory. The

---

[8] This analysis is not shown as a table in the text

[9] H. Edward Ransford, "Isolation, Powerlessness and Violence: A Study of Attitudes and Participation in the Watts Riot," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 73 (1968), 581-591.

[10] John R. Forward and Jay R. Williams, "Internal-External Control and Black Militancy," Journal of Social Issues, v. 26, no. 1 (1970), 75-92.

"blocked-opportunity" theory, as defined by Forward and Williams, predicts that persons most likely to be riot participants are those who have high aspirations and believe in their ability to achieve these goals and who also perceive that it is external discrimination and not their own inadequacy which prevents them from effecting their goals; the "alienation-powerlessness" theory predicts that violence supporters are persons who are isolated from society, feel their inferior position in society is due to prejudice, and experience a strong, internal sense of subjective powerlessness.[11]

Although there is some overlap between these two definitions or theories, the formulation does lend itself to empirical testing.[12] Based on their respondents' assessment of the Detroit riots as "Good," "Bad," or "Uncertain," Forward and Williams report that their results "provide substantial support for the blocked-opportunity theory of riot causation and little support for the alienation-powerlessness theory"; respondents who assessed the riot as having been "Good" were unambiguously less rather than more fatalistic about their ability to control their lives and futures than were respondents who thought the riots had been "bad."[13] In other words, it was respondents who felt their opportunities were blocked by external forces rather than those who felt a sense of powerlessness who were violence prone as measured by endorsement of the riots.

In the present study, the competing theories were tested by classifying respondents who agreed with the statement that "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life" as high on "alienation-powerlessness" [fatalism] and classifying respondents as high on sense of "blocked opportunity" if they said their opportunities for the future were poor or if they responded to the open-ended item, "What is the biggest problem holding black people back in your city?" by citing "racial discrimination" or "lack of job opportunities" rather than "laziness or other bad habits" or "lack of education, skills, ambition, ability, or confidence in one's self." Violence-proneness [riot support] was assessed with the item, "How do you feel about the ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people?"[14] The percentages of respondents who were high and low on "alienation-powerlessness" and "blocked-opportunity" and on both variables combined and who rejected ("Disagree" or "Disagree very much") non-violence are shown in Table 17.

---

[11] Ibid., 77-78.

[12] Although both groups of individuals by definition perceive external forces as limiting their opportunities, the "blocked-opportunity" group is high on sense of personal power (internal control) and the "alienation powerlessness" is low on sense of internal control and high on sense of powerlessness (fatalistic).

[13] Op. cit., 89-84.

[14] Violence-proneness [riot support] also was independently assessed with the item, "Do you think it is possible that you might ever find yourself participating in a riot?", but this definition was dropped when it was found that respondents high on "alienation-powerlessness" did not differ from those who were low and respondents who were high on "blocked opportunity" did not differ from those who were low.

TABLE 17

Percentages of Respondents in Alienation-Powerlessness and Blocked-Opportunity Groups who Disagreed or Disagreed Very Much with Non-Violence

Alienation-Powerlessness				Blocked Opportunity 1				Blocked Opportunity 2				Blocked Opportunity 3			
High (a)		Low (b)		High (c)		Low (d)		High (e)		Low (f)		High (g)		Low (h)	
%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
40	(64)	23	(418)	29	(130)	22	(427)	29	(107)	19	(175)	33	(43)	Not Computed	

(a) Respondents who "Agreed" or "Agreed very much" with "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life."
(b) Respondents who "Disagreed" or "Disagreed very much" with "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life."
(c) Respondents who perceived their opportunities for the future as "Very poor," "Poor," or "Mediocre."
(d) Respondents who perceived their opportunities for the future as "Good" or "Very good."
(e) Respondents who cited "racial discrimination" and "lack of job opportunities" in identifying the biggest problem holding black people back.
(f) Respondents who cited laziness or other bad habits or lack of education, skills, ambition, ability, or confidence in one's self in identifying the biggest problem holding black people back.
(g) Respondents in categories c and e above.
(h) Respondents in categories d and f above.

As shown in Table 17, respondents who were high on "alienation-powerlessness" (fatalistic) rejected non-violence nearly twice as often as those who were low. Respondents who were high on "blocked opportunity" as measured either by perceptions of personal opportunities for the future or by belief concerning problems holding back black people rejected non-violence only 7 to 10 percent more frequently than did those who were low on either of these measures of blocked opportunity considered separately. Moreover, when blocked opportunity was defined as relative pessimism about one's opportunities for the future and by belief that the problems of black people are due to racial discrimination or lack of job opportunities, the percentage of respondents who were high on blocked opportunity and who rejected non-violence increased to 33% - a figure which still was slightly lower than the 40% of respondents who were high on "alienation-powerlessness" and who rejected non-violence.

Although these results disagree with Forward and Williams' conclusion that "blocked opportunity" is much more important than "alienation-powerlessness" in predicting support for violence among black youth, they do support Forward and Williams' finding that perceptions of blocked opportunity are associated with support for violence. The results also support Ransford's conclusion that fatalism is associated with ideological support for violence among black Americans. Thus our conclusion is that feelings of blocked opportunity and of alienation-powerlessness /fatalism/ are both associated with dispositions among black youth to reject "the ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people."[15] In addition, it also should be noted that although there are major differences between Forward and Williams' definitions of the variables and the definitions we used, these differences in no way obviate the legitimacy of our conclusion that both the blocked opportunity theory and the alienation-powerlessness theory have some support in the data reported in this section.

Summary

A number of conclusions are suggested by the data reported in this chapter. In some cases patterns of interrelationships among attitudes were uncovered by examining data from a single city in which relationship among a given set of attitudes seemed to be closer than in the other cities. While this type of analysis can only point to generalized relationships which might be clear and relatively universal across cities if it were possible to obtain more precise data, a strong relationship found in even one city does support the conclusion that attitudes among black youth on the matters investigated in the present study do tend to be inter-related. Given the difficulties of obtaining an accurate reading on issues which involve a good deal of emotion and are difficult to measure for a variety of reasons including ambiguity among respondents, acquiescent response set, distrust of questionnaires, complexity of interrelationships, problems inherent in scale construction, and many other reasons, zero-order correlations of .3 or .4 and multiple correlations of .5 or .6 such as were several times reported in this chapter actually are fairly high. The most important conclusions suggested by these data were as follows:

1. Expectations concerning whether "problems between blacks and whites will be solved in a peaceful and constructive way" are related to trust in whites and liking for whites but not directly to number of whites known well.

2. Trust in whites but not liking for whites or number of whites known well is directly associated with expectations regarding separatism.

3. Tendencies to reject "the ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people" are associated with dislike for whites, perceptions that job problems are serious, pessimism concerning the peaceful resolution of black-white problems, unfavorable ratings of local police services and pessimism concerning personal opportunities for the future.

4. Pessimism concerning personal opportunities for the future is associated with dislike for whites, sense of fatalism or powerlessness, few whites known well, and negative evaluation of local employment services.

---

[15] For our total sample, blocked opportunity as measured by perceptions of personal opportunities for the future was correlated at .27 with fatalism as measured by the item, "People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life." While this correlation is high enough to indicate that the two items definitely are associated, it is not high enough to reject the conclusion that blocked opportunity and alienation-powerlessness are independently associated with acceptance of non-violence.

5. Negative attitudes toward the police are associated directly with distrust of and dislike for whites. In Upper Midwestern City, number of whites known well also appears to be directly associated with attitude toward the police and dislike of whites appears to be a mediating variable between trust in whites and attitude toward the police. The latter relationship could mean, of course, either that negative attitude toward the police leads first to dislike and then distrust for whites or that distrust of whites leads to dislike of whites and then negative feelings about the police, or both.

6. Willingness to live in an integrated neighborhood, at least in Lower Midwestern City, is associated with expectations that separatism will not occur, unfavorable attitude toward the police, and expectations that black-white problems will be peacefully resolved. Perceptions that integrated housing is desirable are associated with favorable attitudes toward the police and expectations that black - white problems will be peacefully resolved.

XII. Comparison with Other Research

Although very little research has been conducted focusing on the attitudes of black youth of high-school age, a substantial amount of information is available regarding the attitudes of Negro adults, particularly in the last five years since civil disturbances in many cities has stimulated a growing interest in and recognition of the importance of this topic. We have reviewed a sizable number of these studies in order to identify ways in which they may agree or disagree with the data described in this report. The results are reported in this chapter.

Attitudes toward police

One of the striking findings reported in several other studies as well as this one is the extensiveness of negative feelings toward the police among black Americans. In the present study, for example, only 30% of our respondents described themselves as having favorable attitudes toward the police. This figure was farily comparable to the 27% of respondents who rated the police as "Excellent" or "Good" with regard to four types of police practice in a 1964 study of black residents of New York City's Bedford-Stuyvesant Area and the 38% of black respondents who rated the police as "Very good" or "Good" in a 1967 study in Detroit.[1]

Definition of Black Power

An interview study carried out in 1967 among 461 black adults in Detroit included the question, "What do the words 'black power' mean to you?"[2] Many of the categories into which answers were classified differed markedly from the categories we used in connection with our item, "What does 'Black Power' mean to you?", thus making it impossible to compare all the responses obtained in the Detroit study with all those in the present study. However, we can compare proportions in a few categories which were the same or similar in the two studies.

One of the response categories used in the Detroit study was "Racial (Black) Unity." Twenty-three percent of the respondents gave answers which were classified in this category. In the present study we used the category "Black unity and pride" and found that 22% of our respondents were placed in this category.

Four of the categories used in the Detroit study were "Blacks Rule Whites," "Racism," and "Trouble, Rioting, Civil Disorder," and "Nothing"; altogether, 39% of the responses were in these categories (22% were in the "Nothing" category). The only comparable categories we used which included at least 1% of the responses of students in our sample were "Just a word - nothing; confusion; foolishness" and "Black takeover or rule of the country or world." In our total sample, 14% of the responses were placed in these categories.

---

[1] Harlan Hahn and Joe R. Feagin, "Riot-Precipitating Police Practices: Attitudes in Urban Ghettoes," Phylon, v. 31, no. 2 (Summer 1970), 183-193.

[2] Joel D. Aberbach and Jack L. Walker, 'The Meanings of Black Power: A Comparison of White and Black Interpretations of a Political Slogan," The American Political Science Review, v. 64, no. 2 (June 1970), 367-388.

This difference between the two studies is not surprising when it is realized that most of the 39% of respondents falling in the four categories mentioned above in the Detroit study were negative about the term "Black Power." As the authors of the report pointed out, "We encountered few racist, anti-white interpretations of black power among our black respondents and most of those came from respondents who were not sympathetic to black power."[3] This suggests that a much higher percentage of respondents in the Detroit study were unfavorable concerning the term "Black Power" than was true in the present study. Thus 50% of the Detroit respondents were classified as unfavorable to the term, whereas the great majority of our respondents defined "Black Power" in terms that were neutral or clearly positive. This finding in turn suggests that black youth probably are much more positive about the concept of "Black Power" than are their parents - a finding which was independently confirmed in another study conducted in Kansas City.[4]

In general, however, the types of responses students in our sample gave in defining the term "Black Power" and in responding to other items are characterized quite well in the following sentences in which the investigators in the Detroit study summarized their findings:

> There was chauvinism and some glorification of blackness, especially among those who interpret black power as a call for racial unity or solidarity, but most were pro-black rather than anti-white. Black unity definitions of black power are not disguised appeals for separation from American society; at least, not at the present moment.[5]

Rejection of non-violence

One of the largest studies of the attitudes of black people in the United States was carried out in 1967 and 1968 by Campbell and Schuman for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. The study included interviews with approximately 2800 black citizens in 15 cities.[6] The authors of the study reported that 22% of their black respondents between the ages of 16 and 19 said they would be willing to use violence to gain equal rights.[7] This figure agrees very closely with the 19% of respondents in the present study who said they either "Disagree very much" or "Disagree" with "the ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people."

---

[3] Ibid., p. 387.

[4] Joseph P. Caliguri, Daniel U. Levine, and Ahden Tangeman, "Black Power Attitudes Among Students in a Black Junior High School," Kansas City: Center for the Study of Metropolitan Problems in Education, 1970 (mimeo).

[5] Aberbach and Walker, op. cit., p. 387.

[6] Angus Campbell and Howard Schuman, "Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities." Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, June 1968.

[7] Older respondents and poorly educated respondents were less supportive of violence than were the young or the better educated.

By way of contast, Louis Harris conducted a national poll of black opinion in the early part of 1970 and reported that 31% of the 1,255 respondents who were interviewed and 40% of the 14-21 year olds believed that blacks 'will probably have to resort to violence to win their rights."[8] In the present study, no more than 22% of our respondents in any of the five cities and no more than 20% in any of the four non-southern cities said they disagreed with the idea of non-violence. Harris' percentages do not include respondents who had no opinion and his interview questions apparently forced respondents into a dichotomous response either agreeing that "violence is probably necessary to gain rights" or agreeing that black people "can win rights without violence." It is probable that these differences in the research approach and differences in the way questions were worded account for the large difference between Harris' results on the one hand and those in the present study and the fifteen-city study conducted by Campbell and Schuman on the other.

Support for organizations

Harris also asked respondents to identify the groups which "represent my own personal views." Twenty-five percent of his respondents selected the Black Panthers and 64% agreed that the "Panthers given me a sense of pride."[9] Forty-three percent of his respondents between the ages of 14 and 21 were reported as agreeing that the Black Panthers represented their own personal views. These figures are in close agreement with the 42% of respondents in the present study who cited the Black Panthers as a group "doing the most to help black people" and the tendency among those respondents who cited the Black Panthers to specify development of black pride as their major way the Panthers are "helping black people."

This does not mean, however, that black Americans believe the Panthers or other militant groups are very effective in ways other than the development of black pride. Just as Harris found that only 29% of his respondents rated "leaders of black militant groups" as "very effective" in terms of overall leadership (as compared with 71%, 67%, and 56% ratings for black elected officials, civil rights leaders, and black religious leaders, respectively), only about 15% of our respondents cited the Panthers as making contributions involving political, economic, or educational improvement in black communities.

Support for separatism

Another question used in the fifteen-city study conducted by Campbell and Schuman which was comparable to one in the present study asked respondents whether they thought there should be a separate black nation within the United States.[10] Ten percent of the black respondents between the ages of 16 and 19 were reported in agreement with the statement. This figure compares fairly well with the 14% of respondents in the present study who said it either was "Desirable" or "Very desirable" that the United States "be separated into two nations, one black and one white." It also should be noted that Campbell and Schuman found a directly proportional relationship between age and rejection of separatism. Since the students in our five-city sample were younger than the youngest subgroup (16-19 year olds) in the fifteen-city sample, it is reasonable to expect that a higher proportion of respondents in our sample - though still a minority - would be supportive of separatism than was true among 16-19 year olds in the fifteen-city sample. It will be important to observe whether this phenomena is verified in further research spanning a wider age range than was available in the present study and whether black youth of high school age retain their relatively high degree of sympathy for separatism as they become young adults or are followed by increasingly more separatist waves of black youth who enter high school in the future.

---

[8] Louis Harris, 'The Black Mood: More Militant, More Hopeful, More Determined," _Time_, April 6, 1970, 28-29. The figure of 31% was 10% higher than the comparable 21% Harris reported were in agreement with the statement in 1966.

[9] Louis Harris, _op. cit._

[10] Campbell and Schuman, _op. cit._

Rating of local services and facilities

A 1967 study of the ratings of local neighborhood services and facilities of more than 6,000 residents in five "poverty" neighborhoods in Pittsburgh was reported by Gilbert and Eaton in 1960.[11] Two of the neighborhoods included in the study have black populations of 89% and 71%, respectively. In the neighborhood in which 89% of the residents were black, the percentages of respondents who rated selected services as "positive," "neutral," and "negative" (as classified by the investigators) were as follows:[12]

Housing: 57% positive; 16% neutral; 27% negative.
Police: 58% positive; 10% neutral; 14% negative.
Schools: 79% positive; 07% neutral, 14% megative.

By way of contrast, it will be recalled that respondents in the present study were more negative than positive about local services and facilities. With regard to the three services or facilities cited above, for example, ratings in our five-city sample were as follows:[13]

Housing: 15% positive; 33% neutral [mediocre]; 52% negative.
Police: 20% positive; 25% neutral; 55% negative
Schools [Education]: 34% positive; 38% neutral; 2[illegible] negative.

While respondents in both samples were considerably more positive about local schools than about housing facilities and police services, respondents in Gilbert and Eaton's Pittsburgh sample were much more positive about all three services than were respondents in our five-city sample. It is true that there was substantial variation from city to city in our sample, but in no city in our sample were respondents anywhere near as positive about local neighborhood services or conditions as were those in the Pittsburgh study. It is possible that differences in the two studies are due primarily to the fact that the Pittsburgh study sampled adults and our sample consisted of high school students, to the three-year span between the studies, or to distinctive conditions which make black respondents in poverty neighborhoods in Pittsburgh more positive about local neighborhood services than is true in neighborhoods sampled in the cities included in the present study. Also, ratings of police services in the Gilbert and Eaton study were much higher than have been reported in other studies cited in this chapter, thus suggesting that the Pittsburgh data may be atypical due to such reasons as distinctiveness of local conditions or errors in sampling and data collection.

---

[11] Neil Gilbert and Joseph W. Eaton, "Who Speaks for the Poor?", American Institute of Planners Journal, v. 36, no. 6 (November 1970), 411-416.

[12] "Positive" ratings as defined by Gilbert and Eaton included the response categories "All right" and "Very good." "Negative" ratings included the response categories "Terribly bad" and "Pretty bad."

[13] For purposes of this comparison, the "Very good" and "Good" categories and the "Very poor" and "Poor" categories have been collapsed into "positive" and "neutral" categories.

Influence of Social Background Variables

As noted in an earlier part of this report, it was found that the attitudes of respondents in our sample were not strongly or consistently related to the social class of their families, sex, or grade level in school. In general, this finding agrees with much previous research which indicates that with the occasional exception of age in studies including a wide age range, neither the attitudes nor the behaviors of black Americans on matters involving civil rights and race relations are strongly related to these social background factors. One recent report on the attitudes of black youth in Western Contra Costa County, for example, indicated there was "negligible influence of status origin in group orientation" toward militant or nationalist groups such as the Black Muslims.[14] The author went on to note that "most studies which have found an association between approval of the Muslims and low status were not based on adolescents.[15] The finding also agrees with our previous finding that the attitudes of black high school students in Kansas City were strikingly similar for students classified by sex, grade level, and social-class background.[16]

Similarly, an analysis by Schuman and Gruenberg of the relationship between demographic and socioeconomic variables and the attitudes of black respondents in the fifteen-city sample studied by Campbell and Schuman also indicated that the associations betwen attitudes and social background variables were very slight.[17] Thus the authors reported, for example, that only 3.4% of the variance in black respondents' ratings of local neighborhood services and only 2.1% of the variance on perceptions of riot causes were associated with the five "individual attributes" of age, sex, education, occupation, and family income. They further pointed out that in general survey-type research these attributes "often constitute the totality of major explanatory background variables . . ., and provide a touchstone for what can be achieved by such variables with these data."[18] They therefore concluded that with respect to attitudes involving race and urban conditions, "race creates greater differences in perspective on these questions than does income or sex."[19]

---

[14] Glen H. Elder, Jr., "Group Orientations and Strategies in Racial Change," Social Forces, v. 48, no. 4 (June 1970), 445-461.

[15] Ibid., 453.

[16] Fiddmont and Levine, op. cit.

[17] Howard Schuman and Barry Gruenberg, "The Impact of City on Racial Attitudes," American Journal of Sociology, v. 76, no. 2 (September 1970), 213-261.

It is possible that part of the reason social class background seldom is found correlated with attitudinal variables among black youth is due to the difficulty of measuring and lack of adequate measures of social class background among black Americans. Existing social class measures have been developed and validated primarily or exclusively utilizing majority white samples. Because occupation, education, and other components of social class do not have precisely the same meaning in predominantly-black communities as in national white samples, existing social class measures appear to be less valid, on the whole, for black respondents than for white respondents. While a certain amount of work has been done, particularly in the U. S. Census Bureau, to develop better social class measures for black populations, such measures have not to our knowledge been refined enough (if, indeed, they can be) to correlate highly with attitudes on civil rights or related matters. In addition, as noted in the next section there is reason to believe that commonalities in black experience tend to swamp social class and other social background factors to a much greater degree than generally is the case among white populations.

City Size and Variation Among Cities

On the whole, this study found few very large or systematic differences between the attitudes of black youth in the cities included in the sample; for this reason, we were able to describe the attitudes of an "average" respondent in the sample.[20] Like the finding that the attitudes of our respondents were not consistently related to social background variables, this suggests that the attitudes of black youth tend to have much in common wherever they live and whatever their background.

This finding also is substantially in agreement with Schuman and Gruenberg's analysis of the data Campbell and Schuman collected in the fifteen-city study. Schuman and Gruenberg reported that although city accounted for more variance in the attitudes of black respondents than did "individual attributes" /social background/, only with respect to "variables that are largely cognitive in nature" (i.e., the behavior of specific local government officials) was the percent of variance accounted for by city of appreciable magnitude (e.g., 17.2% of the variance in "Believes mayor is not trying hard to solve city problems" was accounted for by "city"). With regard to such variables as "Prefers association with blacks only," "Riots were a black protest, not simply looting," and "Dissatisfaction with neighborhood services," however, the percentages of variance accounted for by differences between cities were 1.3%, 2.2%, and 3.8%, respectively.[21] Because Schuman and Gruenberg were more concerned with the possible relationship between black respondents' attitudes and the percentage of black citizens in the cities in their sample, they did not comment at length on the possibility of an association between size of the ghetto and attitudes. They do, however, report data showing that on attitudes such as those of concern in this study (i.e., neighborhood services; discrimination; police; self-determination; and violence orientation), the correlations between attitudes and size of city on the whole were about as high as those between attitudes and percentage of population Negro, and neither sets of correlations were as high as those between attitudes and size of the black population. For example, the correlation between size of the black population and satisfaction with neighborhood services was -.46, whereas the corresponding correlations between satisfaction with neighborhood services and size of city and percentage of population Negro were -.31 and -.11, respectively.[22] These findings are compatible with the evidence we reported suggesting that size of the ghetto and/or size of city may be significantly related to black Americans' attitudes on matters involving race relations, civil rights, neighborhood conditions, and related matters.

---

[18] Ibid., p. 224.

[19] Ibid., p. 240.

[20] Although we chose to describe the average respondent in the non-southern cities, on most items we could easily have done this instead for the sample as a whole.

Conclusion

We have reviewed some of the research conducted during the past four or five years examining the attitudes of black Americans on matters such as those investigated in the present study and found that our results generally parallel or approximate findings reported elsewhere. In the few cases where the types and levels of responses we obtained appear to differ very much from data reported in previous research, differences in the age of our sample or the wording of our questions as compared with other studies account quite well for these divergent results. The only finding reported elsewhere which seems inexplicably incongruent with our own was in connection with perceptions of local services among residents of a black neighborhood in Pittsburgh. The size of the differences between the Pittsburgh data and our own suggest either that black youth may be considerably more discontented with local neighborhood conditions than are black adults or that the Pittsburgh neighborhood in question may be unusually highly-rated by its residents. In any case the Pittsburgh data need not be viewed as seriously challenging the validity of the data reported in this study.

Given the congruence between our five-city data and research reported elsewhere as well as the general consistency we found across the five cities and among subgroups of black youth classified by social class, sex, and grade level, common forces must be affecting the perceptions of black youth in many if not most neighborhoods and cities. Several of the forces which possibly may be operating in this way have been described as follows by Seymour Spilerman at the conclusion of a paper examining the possible causes of civil disturbances which occurred in U. S. cities betwen 1961 and 1968:

---

[21] Schuman and Gruenberg, op. cit., 218-220.

[22] Ibid., p. 248.

> The conclusion from this analysis is that the racial disturbances of the 1960's were not responses to conditions in the local community. Disorder-prone cities do differ from their less traumatized neighbors in many significant respects. . . .However, these conditions have little to do with a community being prone to racial disorder, and are instead the incidental characteristics of cities with large Negro populations. . . .
>
> Each of these factors - the national government, television, and the development of black solidarity - has served to expose Negroes to stimuli which are uniform across communities. It is not that local conditions do not differ significantly for the Negro, rather it is that these variations are overwhelmed by the above considerations.[23]

In addition, the facts of life in segregated black neighborhoods such as those served by schools included in our sample from five cities inherently involve certain commonalities from one neighborhood or city to the next and thus can be expected to exert a common influence on the attitudes of black youth and adults. That is, the experience of growing up and living in subsocieties isolated from a larger society generates certain similarities in the perceptions and beliefs of the members of such subsocieties, particularly in the case of groups like black Americans which have been systematically excluded from fully participating in the larger society by a seamless web of interlocking racist institutions. Examples of such similarities associated with the dynamics of racial isolation have been aptly described as follows by a Scandanavian anthropologist who examined ghetto life in Washington, D. C. from the viewpoint of a relatively neutral and independent outside observer:

> As the ghetto dwellers experience the behavior of white businessmen and policemen and work out interpretations of it together, they arrive at a collective definition of their grievances. They chuckle as they see a good friend and neighbor leave by the back door as the bill collector enters through the front door. They find themselves under constant surveillance from slow-moving patrol cars and feel they know what the policemen inside are thinking about them. They note that the "fresh greens" at the grocery look like they have been around for some time, and that the children they send to the store on an errand often seem to get too little change in return. And they know of instances when policemen "accidentally" shot those suspected of only minor offenses--something they can only see as gross disregard for black lives. Of course, a great deal of the interaction between the ghetto dwellers and these white outsiders in their territory flows quite smoothly. Quite possibly, too, the outsiders may be able to explain satisfactorily some of

---

[23] Seymour Spilerman, 'The Causes of Racial Disturbances: A Comparison of Alternative Explanations," American Sociological Review, v. 35, no. 4 (August 1970), 645-646.

> that behavior of theirs which from the ghetto dwellers' point of view is only evil. But what matters is that the people of the ghetto do in fact accumulate and share among themselves so much evidence of injuries to their interests and honor, and that they find little or no reason not to see the merchants as exploiters and the police as oppressors. . . .
>
> . . . The typical black-and-white joke at the Howard Theatre is still about the Ku Klux Klan. Whether or not the understanding of white people's racial attitudes which this reflects remains correct today, the institutionalized segregation of ghetto dwellers prevents many of them from finding out much about the current state of white opinion at first hand. Just as black people are taught about the meaning of blackness by other blacks, they learn about white people and race relations within the ghetto community rather than in face-to-face contacts with whites. White people are being typed by black people, as "crackers," "grays," "Whitey," "Mr. Charlie," "ofays," "PWT" (poor white trash), "honkies," or "blue-eyed blond devils" (a Muslim term), just as white people among themselves are typing black people. In both cases the vocabulary becomes a cultural storehouse for hostility, a part of the community's own information about its external affairs which is seldom contradicted by other sources. Perhaps the white suburbs do not all share the views of the Klan, but the unemployed streetcorner man who hardly knows any white people personally does not necessarily know. As far as he is concerned, the machinery of the society may still seem like a Klan device to keep him down, and it is not impossible to fit ghetto merchants, the police, and many fleeting contacts with other whites into such an interpretation. In his state of isolation from mainstream society, a ghetto dweller may well view institutionalized segregation as a direct expression of average white personal prejudice. Whether he is correct in this or not, the impact of this is such that he will take any not obviously prejudiced white person with whom he comes in contact to be an exception to the rule.[24]

---

[24] Ulf Hannerz, Soulside. Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969, pp. 165-66.

XIII. Summary and Discussion of Major Conclusions

Chapter II portrayed the responses of the "average" respondent in the four northern cities by describing the general level of response on items in the questionnaire. For the most part there was relatively close agreement among respondents from city to city. Highlights of this portrayal indicated that the average respondent is distrustful of most whites; knows few if any white persons well; believes that employment problems in his city are serious, partly due to racial discrimination; is favorably disposed toward the concept of Black Power, which he defines in terms of achieving equality, freedom, and racial pride; agrees with the ideas of those who believe non-violence is the best way to achieve black goals; does not believe that black-white problems will be solved in a peaceful and constructive way; is optimistic about his personal opportunities for the future; perceives housint, employment, law enforcement, recreation, and welfare services or facilities for black people in his city as poor to mediocre; is willing to live in an integrated neighborhood but does not think integrated housing is particularly important; and either has not changed his mind much in the past few years or has become more optimistic about the topics investigated in the questionnaires.

Chapter III reported on responses to the items, "What groups do you feel are doing the most to help black people?" and "In what ways are these groups doing the most to help black people?" The NAACP and the Black Panthers were cited far more frequently than other groups and organizations, and several local groups active in one or another city were cited fairly frequently by respondents in those cities. Groups which were cited as "doing the most to help black people" generally were seen as helping by "bringing black people together," "helping set up black business," "helping to find jobs," "encouraging education," and "developing black pride." Groups were seldom cited as making a contribution by "telling the man off" or "influencing the government"; however, the Black Panthers were cited more frequently than the NAACP for "telling the man off" as well as for "developing black pride," while the NAACP was cited more frequently than the Panthers for "helping to find jobs."

Chapter IV described differences among the four northern cities. Indications were found that black youth in very large northern cities may be more negative about local neighborhood conditions and services, more pessimistic about their opportunities for the future, more expectant that separatism would occur and (to a lesser extent) more supportive of separatism, and more inclined to attribute "violence among some black people" to lack of opportunity than are black youth in smaller northern cities. In addition, the data suggested that black youth in very large northern cities may be more fatalistic (i.e., greater sense of powerlessness) than black youth in smaller northern cities. Particularly because the number of cities included in the present study is so small, these conclusions must be viewed as tentative and primarily as suggestive of further research; nevertheless they also point to the possibility that black youth in the north may become more alienated in many of their attitudes if they become more isolated in growing urban ghettoes in the future.

Chapter V reported differences between Deep South City and the four northern cities. Deep South City respondents were more expectant that schools in the north will be integrated, more inclined to define a ghetto as a "concentration camp," "prison," "restricted area," or "reservation," more positive about local neighborhood services and facilities, more favorable toward the police, more inclined to see themselves as participating in a riot, more inclined to attribute violence which "some black citizens have engaged in" to an effort to gain equal rights, and more inclined to cite the Black Muslims as doing the most to help black people than were respondents in the northern cities. These differences were interpreted as resulting at least in part from Deep South City respondents' relative lack of knowledge of conditions and circumstances in black communities in the urban north. In addition, Deep South City respondents were more inclined to define "Black Power" in terms of 'Total equality and freedom to do what whites do," more inclined to cite racial discrimination and less inclined to cite lack of unity as the "biggest problem holding black people back in your city," more inclined to associate serious job problems with societal causes, less inclined to feel they live in a ghetto, and more inclined to say their attitudes had become more optimistic in the past few years than were respondents in the four northern cities. These results were interpreted in terms of differences in conditions which may exist in small southern cities as compared with large cities of the urban north.

Chapter VI described differences which were found between Upper Midwestern City and the other four cities in the sample. Respondents in Upper Midwestern City reported they knew fewer whites well and were more supportive and expectant of separatism, more negative about local services and facilities, and more pessimistic about their opportunities for the future than were respondents in the other four cities. These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that black youth isolated in very large urban ghettoes are likely to be more alienated from and negative about U. S. society than their counterparts who may be somewhat less isolated in smaller ghettoes elsewhere.

Chapter VII summarized differences which were found between Kansas City and the other four cities in the sample. Kansas City respondents knew more whites well and were more favorable and trusting toward whites, less inclined to cite the Black Panthers as "doing the most to help black people," less inclined to disagree with the "ideas of black people" who argue for non-violence, more inclined to expect a peaceful and constructive resolution of racial problems, less inclined to rate job problems as serious, more inclined to say organizations had helped black people by "helping set up black business," and more likely to define "Black Power" as "just another word" than were respondents in the other four cities. These results were interpreted as raising the possibility that traditional community development approaches which do not require either eliminating the racial ghetto or giving real power to its inhabitants may be working relatively well in Kansas City as compared with other cities in our sample; however, it would be unwise to view the Kansas City situation in too favorable a light considering that black youth in Kansas City are nearly as isolated and in some respects alienated as in the other cities and the considerable evidence in this report and elsewhere which suggests that national commonalities in social conditions affect the attitudes of black youth in urban centers throughout the United States.

Chapter VIII described differences which were found between the attitudes of Kansas City respondents in a 1968 sample and the 1970 sample included in the present study. As compared with the 1968 sample, respondents in the 1970 sample were: more polarized in high- and low-contact-with-whites groups, more distrustful toward whites, less expectant that white and black communities would become fully separate, less polarized and more uncertain concerning the desirability of separatism, less expectant that problems between blacks and whites will be resolved peacefully, less negative about employment and police services, more inclined to see themselves as living in a ghetto and less inclined to perceive their neighborhoods as safe, less likely to perceive civil disturbances as motivated by revenge rather than desires for equal rights, and less fatalistic about their capacity to control their fate. In most respects, these changes were in the direction of closer agreement with the attitudes expressed by black youth in the other three northern cities included in the study. The increases which occurred in expectations that black-white problems will not be peacefully resolved and in perceptions of living in an unsafe ghetto may mean either that black youth in Kansas City were more realistic in 1970 than in 1968 or that they are becoming more alienated and negative about race relations and living conditions in the city. Whether the increase which was noted in distrust of whites, the decrease which was found in support for separatism, and other differences between the two samples are interpreted as desirable or undesirable depends to a considerable extent on the ideology and philosophy of the observer.

Chapter IX examined relationships among responses to the items dealing with trust in whites, liking for whites, and number of whites known well. Three-way tabulations showing the zero-order associations between any two of these variables with the third accounted for, comparisons between response patterns in the five cities, and correlation analysis were used to identify inter-relationships among the three variables. These analyses and comparisons suggested that two contrasting syndromes are at work among many respondents in our sample, one marked by contact with whites trust in whites, and liking for whites and one by lack of contact with whites, distrust of whites, and dislike for whites. The latter syndrome appears to be much more common than the former, probably more because most respondents had limited contact rather than negative contact with whites. Further analysis also suggested, however, that respondents in Deep South City tend to have more negative though somewhat limited contact with whites and respondents in Eastern City tend to have more negative and frequent contact with whites than do respondents in the other three cities. Respondents in Kansas City, by way of contrast, tend to have frequent and positive contact with whites as compared with other cities in the sample.[1] Because all these analyses were based on cross-sectional contingency data rather than longitudinal data, the results must be viewed as suggestive and tentative rather than definitive and conclusive; nevertheless, data presented in the chapter were internally consistent and provide a logical case for the hypothesis that with many exceptions related to the quality of contact, contact with whites tends to result in favorable attitudes toward whites and lack of contact tends to reinforce or leave undisturbed negative attitudes toward whites which are common among black youth in many if not most black communities.

Chapter X examined the relationship between attitudes regarding the desirability of separatism and orientation toward whites. Using three-way tabulations similar to those described in Chapter IX and correlation analysis of the responses of students in Upper Midwestern City, it was concluded that liking for whites and high number of whites known well when present together are associated with rejection of separatism and that (at least in Upper Midwestern City) liking for whites and trust in whites are intermediate variables between number of whites known well and desirability of separatism. As before, contingency data of the kind reported in this chapter do not allow for definitive conclusions regarding cause-and-effect relationships, though the results suggest that lack of contact with whites and attitude toward whites play a part in determining whether black youth accept or reject separatism.

---

[1] This statement does not hold in objective terms, since 46% of the Kansas City respondents, for example, did not trust as many as 11% of whites.

Chapter XI utilized correlation analysis to examine the relationships among a variety of attitude items included in the questionnaire. In several cases relationships were highlighted by examining data on a single city in which items appeared to be inter-correlated more strongly than was true in the other cities. Major findings in this chapter were as follows: Expectations regarding the resolution of racial problems is associated with trust in whites and liking for whites; Expectations regarding separatism is associated with trust in whites; Attitudes regarding non-violence is slightly associated with liking for whites and also is associated with perceptions of job problems, rating of police services, expectations regarding the resolution of racial problems, and personal opportunities for the future; Personal opportunities for the future is associated with liking for whites, ratings of the quality of local employment services, fatalism, and number of whites known well; Attitude toward the police is associated with trust in whites and liking for whites; Willingness to live in integrated neighborhoods is associated with attitude toward the police, desirability of separatism, and expectations regarding the resolution of racial problems; and perceptions regarding the desirability of integrated housing are associated with attitude toward the police and expectations regarding the resolution of racial problems. Although many of the relationships described above were weak, multiple correlations sometimes enabled us to use two or three variables to account for as much as 30 to 45% of the variance in another. Because these percentages are fairly high considering the amount of error and distortion inevitably found in data of the kind reported in this study, they offer firm support for the conclusion that the variables with which we were concerned on the questionnaire play an important part in shaping the attitudes of students in our sample.

Chapter XII provided comparisons between our findings and other research on the attitudes of black Americans conducted in the last few years. For the most part our data are in close agreement with results reported in other research on the attitudes of black Americans in general and the attitudes of black youth in particular. This similarity was interpreted as reflecting the influence of national forces as well as the effects of commonalities in the physical and psychological environments characteristic of predominantly-black communities in the United States today.

Having reviewed the major conclusions suggested by the data in this study, we will conclude by stressing the following generalizations which summarize the most important findings and trends:

1. Attitudes of black youth in the five cities included in this study were relatively uniform from city to city.

2. Respondents tended to have little contact with and to be distrustful toward whites but tended to reject separatism and violence. Although they were optimistic about their personal future, in general they were dissatisfied with the quality of local public services and facilities for black people.

3. High contact with whites is directly related to trust in whites and liking for whites and indirectly related to support for separatism. Orientation toward whites and attitudes involving fatalism, civil rights, and adequacy of local services are interrelated in many ways to the extent that one sometimes can predict 30 to 45% of the variance in one attitude item from data on responses to three or four of the others.

4. Black youth in larger cities with larger ghettoes appear to be more fatalistic and more alienated as defined with reference to such measures as support for separatism, dissatisfaction with local conditions, and pessimism about their future than are black youth in smaller cities with smaller ghettoes.

5. Widespread support exists for both the NAACP and the Black Panthers as well as active local organizations. Contributions being made by the NAACP tend to be defined in concrete, economic terms while contributions being made by the Black Panthers tend to be defined in psychological terms.

Some readers may find it incongruous that black youth simultaneously tend to reject violence and to endorse a group like the Black Panthers which rightly or wrongly has been identified in the mass media with violence. Some may see inconsistencies in the findings that black youth in our sample are extremely distrustful of whites and have little contact with whites but at the same time tend to reject separatism, particularly since we also found a good deal of evidence indicating that trust in whites and contact with whites are related to rejection of separatism.

Such findings are only inconsistencies, of course, to an outsider; for our respondents these attitudes may constitute a coherent set of beliefs which reflect the fact that by and large the majority of black citizens in the United States have remained tenaciously and perhaps inexplicably faithful to traditional American ideals and goals even though they have been systematically isolated and excluded from institutions designed to help Americans attain these goals. In this regard our evidence indicating that black youth who are isolated in the presumably larger and growing ghettoes of larger cities tend to be more alienated (as defined above) than their peers in smaller cities may well be viewed as ominous; these findings lead one to share with Charles Silberman the trepidation he expressed in the title of an article several years ago for Fortune magazine: "Beware the Day They Change Their Minds." Noting our findings regarding the relationship between size of city and the attitudes of black youth, it would be well to heed the urgent warning with which Senator Abraham Ribicoff introduced the "Government Facilities Act of 1971" for himself and Senators Brooke and Cranston on the floor of the U. S. Senate on March 16, 1971:

> . . . we cannot afford to continue to argue in the North who, if anyone, is responsible for the segregation we can see all around us. It is clear that this segregation did not just 'happen.' There is nothing accidental about the fact that in city after city in the north, the blacks and the poor are concentrated in slums in central cities while the whites increasingly are isolated in the surrounding suburbs. . . .
>
> We used to think that segregation in America was a problem of one region, the South. And then we found that in the North only 27.6 percent of black students attend majority white schools while in the South the figure is nearly half again as high - 38.1 percent.
>
> We thought the problem was confined primarily to our schools but now we know the cancer goes to the heart of our society.[2]

---

[2] Congressional Record - Senate, March 16, 1971, S 3249-S 3250.

APPENDIX A

Grade Level ______ Sex ______

What occupation do you think you will work in most of your life? ______

From what source does your family get the largest part of its income? ______

What is the occupation of your father? ______

Circle the highest grade of school completed by your father:

GRADE SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL	COLLEGE
7th 8th	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4 5 6

If your mother is employed, what kind of work does she do? ______

Circle the highest grade of school completed by your mother:

GRADE SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL	COLLEGE
7th 8th	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4 5 6

If you live with a guardian, what kind of work does he/she do? ______

Circle the highest grade he/she completed in school:

GRADE SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL	COLLEGE
7th 8th	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4 5 6

1. What groups do you feel are doing the most to help black people? ______

______ ______

______ ______

2. In what way are these groups doing most to help black people? (Circle one or more answers)

bringing black people together

influencing the government

telling the man off

helping set up black business

helping to find jobs

encouraging education

developing black pride

other (specify) ______

3. What do you think is the most important reason why some black citizens have engaged in violence? (Circle one)

to gain equal rights

to gain revenge

to cover up for looting

out of ignorance or stupidity

due to lack of opportunity

other (specify) ______

4. What does the term "ghetto" mean to you? ______

______

5. Do you feel you live in a ghetto?

6. Do you think your neighbors feel safe in your neighborhood? (Circle One)

Almost all the time Most of the time Not Usually

Seldom Very seldom

7. About what percentage of whites do you feel you can trust? ______

8. How many white people would you say you know well? ______

9. Do you like the average white person you have met? (Circle One)

Almost all Most Some A few

Hardly any None

10. Do you think our country will be separated into two nations, one black and one white? (Circle one)

Certain   Almost Certain   Probably
Probably Not   Very unlikely

11. Do you feel this would be desirable or undesirable? (Circle One)

Very desirable   Desirable   Unsure
Undesirable   Very undesirable

12. Do you think it is possible that you might ever find yourself participating in a riot? (Circle one)

Yes, very possible   Yes, it could happen   Yes, but it isn't probable
Unsure   No, it is unlikely   Impossible

13. If you answered yes, under what conditions could this happen? ____________________

____

14. How would you describe your attitudes toward the police? (Circle one)

Very favorable   Favorable   Not Sure
Unfavorable   Very unfavorable

15. Explain your answer to No. 14 ____________________

____

16. Do you think there are serious problems in getting a job in your city? (Circle one)

Very serious   Moderately serious
Not very serious   Not serious at all

17. Explain your answer to No. 16 ____________________

____

____

18. What does "Black Power" mean to you? ____________________

____

____

19. How do you feel about the ideas of black people who argue that non-violence is the best way to achieve the goals of black people? (Circle one)

Agree very much   Agree much   Agree a little
Disagree   Disagree very much   No opinion

20. What do you think are the three most important things needed to achieve the goals of black people? (Circle three)

Develop personal pride   Peaceful demonstration and protest
Education   Individual determination to succeed
Guerilla warfare   Political power
Retaliation against white racism   Better understanding and communications
Whites accepting blacks as equals   Passing of and implementing Civil Rights Laws
Other (specify) ____________________

21. Do you think the problems between blacks and whites will be solved in a peaceful and constructive way? (Circle one)

Very definitely Definitely Probably
Probably not Definitely not

22. Do you think schools in the north will be integrated? (Circle one)

Very likely Likely Unlikely Very unlikely Unsure

23. If you answered "Very likely" or "Likely", how many years do you think it will take? ____________________

24. Do you feel your opportunities for the future are good? (Circle one)

Very good Good Mediocre Poor Very Poor

25. What is the one biggest problem holding black people back in your city?

____

____

26. What would you say are the two most important reasons why some of your fellow students do poorly in school? (check two)

_____lack of preparation _____unreasonable requirements _____lack of ability _____lack of support at home _____lack of studying _____ teachers don't understand _____lack of ambition _____poor teaching _____lack of equipment and materials in school

27. In your opinion, how adequate are the following services or facilities for black people in your city? (Check one answer for each)

	Very Good	Good	Mediocre	Poor	Very Poor
a. Housing					
b. Employment					
c. Education					
d. Health					
e. Transportation					
f. Police					
g. Recreation					
h. Welfare					

28. If the situation arose, would you be willing to live in an integrated neighborhood? (Circle one)

Definitely Probably Maybe Probably not Definitely not

29. How desirable do you think it is to achieve integrated housing? (Circle one)

Very undesirable Somewhat undesirable Not particularly desirable Desirable
Very desirable

30. How good a student are you? (Circle one)

One of the best students in my class Above the middle of my class
In the middle of my class Below the middle of my class Near the bottom of my class

31. Good luck is more important than hard work for success. (Circle one)

Agree very much Agree Not sure Disagree Disgaree very much

32. People like me don't have much of a chance to be successful in life. (Circle one)

Agree very much   Agree   Not sure   Disagree   Disagree very much

33. My experience has made me feel that life is not worth living. (Circle one)

Never   Rarely   Once in a while   Sometimes   Often   Very often

34. I feel a sense of pride and accomplishment as a result of the kind of person I am. (Circle one)

Very often   Often   Sometimes   Seldom   Very seldom

35. Have you ever been in trouble with the police? (Circle one)

Never   Once   Two or Three times   Four or Five times   More than Five times

36. Have your opinions on the topics in this questionnaire generally changed in the last few years? (Circle one)

Very much   Much   Some   A little   None at all

37. If you said your opinions have changed, how would you describe this change? (Circle one)

Much more optimistic   Somewhat more optimistic   A little more optimistic

A little more pessimistic   Somewhat more pessimistic   Much more pessimistic

None of these terms fits

38. Please explain your answer to No. 37 ____

____

____

This survey is submitted through the

University of Missouri - Kansas City

MDCCCXXXIX

Nelson House
Kansas City, Missouri 64110

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Center For The Study of
Metropolitan Problems in Education

Telephone
816 276-2718